

py H673.19/2

no. 3

1

IROQUOIS ANTHROPOLOGY AT THE MID-CENTURY

WILLIAM N. FENTON AND JOHN WITTHOFT

Reprinted from PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY, Volume 95, Number 3, June, 1951

Reprints in Anthropology from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, No. 3

PENNSYLVANIA STATE LIBRARY
DOCUMENTS SECTION

OCT 25 1967

PROCEEDINGS
of the
American Philosophical Society

Contents of Volume 95, Number 3

Studies of Historical Documents in the Library of the American Philosophical Society

Notable Letters and Papers. WILLIAM E. LINGELBACH.....	209
Letters of Charles Darwin and Other Scientists and Philosophers to Sir Charles Lyell, Bart. EDWIN G. CONKLIN.....	220
Dr. William Smith, David Rittenhouse, and the Canal Plate, September 7, 1777. ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT.....	223
Some Contacts of Benjamin Franklin with Mason and Dixon and their Work. THOMAS D. COPE.....	232
The Deborah Franklin Correspondence. EDWARD M. RILEY.....	239
The Benjamin Vaughan Papers: Discovery and Provenance. MARY VAUGHAN MARVIN.....	246
Dr. Rush to Governor Henry on the Declaration of Independence and the Virginia Constitution. LYMAN H. BUTTERFIELD.....	250
The Reverend Mr. Joseph Morgan, an American Correspondent of the Royal Society, 1732-1739. WHITFIELD J. BELL, JR.....	254
Sellers Papers in the Peale-Sellers Collection. CHARLES COLEMAN SELLERS.....	262
Library Hall: Home of the Library Company of Philadelphia 1790-1880. CHARLES E. PETERSON.....	266
The Frank G. Speck Collection. ANTHONY F. C. WALLACE.....	286
They Knew the Indian: The Men Who Wrote the Moravian Records. PAUL A. W. WALLACE.....	290
Iroquois Studies at the Mid-Century. WILLIAM N. FENTON.....	296
Iroquois Archeology at the Mid-Century. JOHN WITTHOFT.....	311
Methods for Determining Intelligibility among Dialects of Natural Languages. C. F. VOEGELIN and ZELLIG S. HARRIS.....	322

Price for complete number one dollar

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY
INDEPENDENCE SQUARE
PHILADELPHIA 6, PA.

IROQUOIS STUDIES AT THE MID-CENTURY ¹

WILLIAM N. FENTON

Senior Ethnologist, Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution

I

IT seems important to pause and take stock of recent progress in Iroquois studies in the present year. The mid-century mark is also the centennial of scientific ethnology in America that began significantly with the publication of L. H. Morgan's *League of the Ho-de-no-sau-nee*, or Iroquois (Rochester, 1851). While the Iroquois have not threatened international security for a century and a half, and consider themselves poor by contrast with the Founders of their famous confederacy, the field of Iroquois studies has become classic to American anthropology and is by no means worn out and overgrown by neglect. The genealogy of Iroquoian scholarship and growth of the modern generation of Iroquoian scholars has been recounted elsewhere in the *Proceedings* (Vol. 93, No. 3: 233-238, 1949) and in the preface of two recent *Bulletins of the Bureau of American Ethnology* (Fenton, 1951; Wallace, 1951). From Morgan to the late Dr. Frank G. Speck, studies of the Iroquois have attracted outstanding figures in American anthropology. The present article summarizes recent progress under five heads: research, results, needs, horizons, and support.

II

Research. Field work and library research are the two aspects of most cultural study, and Iroquois studies in the tradition of American anthropology have been primarily field centered from the start and only secondarily and of late are they moving into the library and archives. Perhaps this trend from field to library reflects the direction in which American studies are moving as they mature from a century of collecting and field reporting to a new era of maturer synthesis. While the perspective of anthropology, including archaeology, ethnology, and linguistics, has been its field approach, its method has been both historical and

functional. Field work has produced collections of specimens illustrating the life of people both prehistoric and recent; from field collecting have come archives of music and speech on cylinders, discs, wire and tape, note books of vocabularies, and paradigms; and myths and folktales and descriptions of social customs, domestic economy, laws, and religious ceremonies cover reams of paper. Some of these represent mere collecting, but much of the mounting files of printed and manuscript materials comprises adequate scientific reporting. Anthropology faces reference problems familiar to the other more mature historical disciplines and will have to train some scholars in historical and archival techniques.

Field work during 1950 was carried on in ethnology, culture and personality psychology, music, and linguistics in several Iroquoian communities. A. F. Brown (University of Pennsylvania) continued work previously begun at Onondaga Valley, New York, on social structure and personality; G. P. Kurath extended her promising combined study of music (from Fenton's records) and the dance (her own field work) from Seneca, to Six Nations Reserve on Grand River, Ontario, and to Onondaga Valley. Barbeau and Marcel Rioux (National Museum of Canada) were again at Six Nations Reserve pursuing a number of topics: music, medicine, social organization, and linguistics (Mohawk and Cayuga). University of Toronto sent Margaret Pirie, a graduate student in linguistics, to Six Nations, and M. C. Randle continued work on Mohawk. A general survey of Iroquois dialects, suggested to the Library Committee by Voegelin (Indiana) and Harris (Pennsylvania) was undertaken (*cf.* Voegelin, p. 322). Iroquoian linguistics, therefore, ceases to be a much neglected field.

While Six Nations Reserve received a half dozen anthropologists during the summer, the Senecas of Allegany had a rest, and were visited only briefly by Snyderman. New field work began on Mohawk social structure at Caughnawaga, P. Q., by Fred Voget, and his paper, read to the ethnology

¹ The research was carried out with the aid of grants from the research funds of the American Philosophical Society; published by permission of the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.

section of the Iroquois Conference, will be published in the *American Anthropologist*.

The Annual Conference on Iroquois Research, held October 6-8, at Red House, New York, this year divided into separate sessions for archeology and ethnology with history. Since Witthoft reports on archeology, I shall only comment that the plan of separate sessions gave free time to discussion but lacked summary and a general session. The Conference lost the advantage previously gained of hearing an outstanding presentation in each area to archeologists, ethnologists, linguists, and historians alike by admitting too many petty reports of limited interest and which were probably repeated the next week at the Eastern States Archeological Federation where they properly belong. The ethnology session heard the paper of Voget on Caughnawaga, already mentioned, and a definitive paper on "Iroquois Women" by Mrs. Randle, which will appear with the Iroquois Symposium of 1949 (Fenton, 1951). The persistent vigor of Iroquois studies was manifest in attendance and interest at the 1950 Conference, and much of the work is being carried on by distinguished amateurs, although considerable professional activity is going forward in this country and in Canada.

Although the Conference heard no formal papers in history, several developments may be recorded, which relate to library research in ethno-history. Coincident with the search for materials for a political history of the Six Nations (Fenton, 1949a, 1950), the Pennsylvania Historical Commission was assembling similar source materials on the colonial history of Pennsylvania, and Dr. Marius Barbeau interested the Society in acquiring on microfilm Indian vocabularies, grammars, ethnological and historical documents from repositories in Canada. By a happy marriage of interests the collections of both the American Philosophical Society and the Pennsylvania Historical Commission have been enriched.

Some of the collections now available on microfilm to Iroquoian scholars include: Original Indian records of the Indian Commissioners at Albany, Daniel Claus Papers, Alexander McKee Papers, and the Monkton Papers (Public Archives of Canada); Contrecoeur Papers (Archives of the Seminary of Quebec) [to be published]; Huron-French vocabulary of Potier (Montreal Municipal Library); Selections of the Loudoun and Abercrombie Papers (Henry E. Huntington Library); Pickering Papers on Indian Affairs (Massachusetts

Historical Society and Essex Institute of Salem); Draper Collection, including Joseph Brant Papers (State Historical Society of Wisconsin); Schuyler Papers on Indian Affairs, Chalmers Collection (New York Public Library); the O'Reilly Collection of Chapin and Parrish Papers; and the Gallatin Papers (New-York Historical Society); various Indian records (Massachusetts Archives); Marius B. Pierce and other Indian material (Buffalo Historical Society).

These collections were reported to the Iroquois Conference by Dr. S. K. Stevens and Mr. Donald Kent of the Pennsylvania Historical Commission, and the writer.

Inventories have been made or are in process at other manuscript repositories. Paul A. W. Wallace has canvassed the Moravian Archives at Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, noting for us such items in German as David Zeisberger's "Relation of his talk with a Mohawk Chief . . . August, 1758"; "A diary of Br. Cammerhoff's and D. Zeisberger's travel among the Five Nations . . . 3/14 May-6/17 August 1750"; Zeisberger's Journal to Onondaga 1745, and several related sources. Some of the Heckewelder Papers, from the same archive, have been filmed for the American Philosophical Society, and Wallace has calendared them, again noting those frames of pertinent interest to the Conference.

In line with the Society's motto ". . . for promoting useful knowledge," such purely historical study has proved timely and invaluable for the prosecution and defense of Indian claims now pending before the U. S. Court of Claims or in preparation for the Indian Claims Commission. Dr. George S. Snyderman, who has worked in Philadelphia repositories for us, was employed on questions of land tenure by an association of private attorneys for the Indians, and the calendared file on the Six Nations at the Smithsonian Institution has been used by petitioning lawyers and the staff of the Attorney General equally. Ethno-history is now developing into a branch of applied anthropology.

Returning to Indian considerations of an earlier time, whether 2,000 Iroquois warriors of New York State would remain quiet at home, take up the hatchet of the French, or keep bright the chain of friendship that bound them to the English was the key problem in American Indian politics throughout the eighteenth century. As one phase of the project to reconstruct the political history of the Six Nations, which has been supported by

grants from the American Philosophical Society, the writer spent the month of July at the Huntington Library in San Marino, California, canvassing the rich collections of historical manuscripts dealing with eastern Indians. The most rewarding materials were found in the collection known as the Loudoun Papers, comprising the military papers of John Campbell, 4th Earl of Loudoun (1705-1782), who is remembered by a place name in Pennsylvania and a county in Virginia (Pargellis, 1933).

After General Braddock's defeat near Fort Duquesne in 1755, the command of all British forces in North America passed to Sir William Shirley, and a year later to Loudoun. From the beginning of his command Loudoun set up a rather effective intelligence service to report conditions on the Indian frontier. Into his headquarters in New York came reports on the Six Nations from Sir William Johnson, superintendent of the Northern Department, and from Edmond Atkin, who, with William Byrd of Virginia, was enlisting the Catawba and Cherokee of Carolina to mobilize at Winchester. The barefoot and hungry southern Indians swarmed into Fort Cumberland to embarrass George Washington who had warned the colonial governors to send up supplies. This vast correspondence contains valuable information on the way of life and the military and political activities of the Six Nations, their neighbors the Delawares and Shawnees who were in the French interest, and their ancient southeastern enemies who were to be allied with the English against the French.

Loudoun was an industrious administrator, if not a great soldier; he devoted much of his attention to writing his agents to persuade various Indian groups to ally themselves with the British. Such were his instructions from Sir Henry Fox, his Majesty's Secretary of State at Whitehall, and George II in his own hand commanded Loudoun above all else to secure the Six Nations as allies. Although Loudoun failed and was recalled in 1758, winning the Six Nations became a guiding British policy in all their subsequent relations with Indians.

From his notes of a month's survey of manuscripts on eastern Indians at the Huntington Library, the writer has prepared for the Library of the American Philosophical Society a check list or short title calendar. When the items listed are microfilmed, the Library will have a guide to

the film with catalog numbers and dates. To single out but a few noteworthy items, the list includes:

HM 3028 c. 1682. Public Records Office, Colonial Office. "Accompt of Iroquois Indians." [giving number and distribution of towns.]

LO 578. 5/30/1755. Atkin, Edmond to the Lords Commissioners for Trade and Plantations. [Details on Southeastern Indians by tribes.]

LO 870. 1756. Peter Randolph and William Byrd. A treaty held with the Catawba and Cherokee Indians. 41 pp. fol.

LO 1124. 5/7/1756. George II. Instructions for . . . cousin . . . Loudoun.

LO 1210. 6/3/1756. Pownall, John. Invoice of Goods for presents to the Five Nations shipped on board the Irene. 2 pp. folio

LO 3485. 4/27/1757. Gov. William Denny to Loudoun. L.S. 3 pp. [Teedyuscung, the Delaware chief, is daily expected to open a treaty which the Six Nations will attend; presents to condole the Six Nations have been sent by Sir William Johnson, because their form requires it . . .]

LO 3490. Information of Canajageya (alias Old Kettle) a sachem of Onondaga . . . [the copy Loudoun sent to Pitt is published in SWJP 2:708-9, but the two copies differ as to tribal identity of an "*Oncida* Indian named Gawickie."]

LO 4690. 10/22/1757. Colden, Cadwallader, Jr. Information of an attack by the Indians.

LO 5433. 1/21/1758. Loudoun to Denny. [Quotes Johnson's intelligence that three of Five Nations have been invited with belts to Wioming to treat with Pennsylvania contrary to Johnson's exclusive commission, King's orders, and Loudoun's policy.]

AB 374. 6/23/1758. Philadelphia. William Denny to Gov. De Lancey of New York. [The Cherokee are enroute north to make peace with their ancient enemies the Six Nations.]

AB 422. 7/8/1758. Philadelphia. State House. William Denny. [Conference with the Indians] Contemp. copy 5 pp. [Missing from the Colonial Records of Pennsylvania, 8:145.]

AB 433. 7/11/1758. Philadelphia. State House. Minutes of an Indian Conference with Teedyuscung . . . [Contemp. copy enclosed in 7/18 Forbes to Abercromby. Not in C.R.P. 8.]

AB 638. 9/10/1758. Ft. Johnson. Sir W. Johnson to Abercromby [Asks for directions and orders. The Johnson Papers at HEH after 9/1/1758 are not yet published. Many follow.]

Suffice it to indicate the character of the British papers at the mid-century, and passing over scattered items relating to the American Revolution, better represented in other collections, we come to one outstanding journal on the important first fed-

eral treaty with the Six Nations at the close of hostilities by a Philadelphia gentleman.

HM 608. Evans, Griffith. [Journal of a trip from Philadelphia to Fort Stanwix to attend "Northern Treaty" with the Indians . . .] A MS. 79 leaves, 5 7/8 × 7 1/4" [Ms. pp. 23(rt.) to 52(rt.), and 101 left cover the treaty.] 8/30/1784–11/13/1785.

Evans landed in Albany at 3 P.M. on September 22, 1784, and was introduced to Arthur Lee of Virginia, Commissioner from Congress for the treaty, and a week later at Ft. Stanwix he met General Wolcott, Commissioner, from Conn., and Rev. Samuel Kirkland, who interpreted; Madison of Virginia, and Lafayette. The Council fire was kindled October 3, and Cornplanter's opening speech commands a high regard for the chief's intellect. Evans is quite amazed at discovering Indian logic and eloquence. Lafayette commits the faux pas of upbraiding the Indians for espousing the cause of the Loyalists, which nearly upset the negotiations. The usual liquor troubles delay affairs, but afford a day of trout fishing. New York, of course, sent a separate set of Commissioners, empowered to negotiate for the sale of Indian lands. The arguments which ensue between the New York State Commissioners and the Commissioners of Congress over state and federal jurisdiction were to confuse relations with these Indians for the next 150 years (Manley, 1932: 82). By the second week of October things began to move. But on the seventeenth, affairs were suspended to hold a condolence ceremony, which ancient custom required, for Captain O'Bale who learned of the death of a son. Next, the old power struggle between the warriors and sachems crept into the negotiations when Captain Aaron, a Mohawk, made an audacious speech, proving himself an enterprising warrior but an impolitic statesman. In the speeches Evans was to hear Indian eloquence known to Forest diplomacy for a century, which redounds in metaphors from the Requickenings Address and the liturgy of the Condolence Council. Cornplanter was to say ". . . the Evil Spirit without a face had come amongst them and Struck a hard blow /behind/ and sent one of the young men under the earth which had very much darkened their minds. . . ." Clearly this is Death, the great faceless (Hewitt, 1944: 66).

But the nicest bits to the ethnologist are the descriptions of a lacrosse game between the Oneida warriors and the Caughnawaga Mohawks for a stake of \$20, which was celebrated by the Warrior's

Stomp Dance around a fire. Ethnologist turned historian looks back over two decades of witnessing Iroquois social dances, which always start off with ga'da'shot, to see through Evans' eyes the file of stomping warriors facing inward toward the fire at half way of the song, and hear with Evans' ears the antiphonal cries and recognize them for what they are—the nonsense refrains of stomp dance.

Journals of treaty negotiations afford the best evidence of how Indians were persuaded to sign away their lands. Naturally, such evidence is crucial now, one hundred and fifty years afterward, in stating claims for injustices done under the terms of the treaty and for defending the Government's position. Official proceedings were reported by the Commissioners whom Congress appointed to conduct the treaties with the Indians, and their journals and reports if not present in the Papers of the Continental Congress (Library of Congress), have possibly been published in the *Journals of the Continental Congress*, in Peter Force's *American Archives*, or in *American State Papers—Indian Affairs* (2 v., Washington, 1832). But official papers seldom report day to day events with the candor of personal journals. On the controversial and crucial Treaty at Greenville (Ohio), 1795, in which the Wyandot and certain central Algonquian tribes made peace with Anthony Wayne and ceded parts of three states, the official proceedings are published (Lowrie and Clark 1832: 1: 562–583). Just which Indian tribes were present, what was the nature of their tribal organization, how did they hold land, where did they remove after the treaty, and precisely who are their descendants? These are some crucial ethno-historical questions facing lawyers today. Of consequent interest is the manuscript journal in the collection of the Huntington Library of a surgeon who accompanied Wayne to Greenville in 1795, and which gives a detailed eye-witness account of the proceedings and relates delays which the Commissioners experienced awaiting the arrival of the Chippewa delegation who quite obviously did not live in the vicinity.

HM 827. Carmichael, John F. [Diary of . . . Surgeon in the 4th Sub-Legion under the command of Major General Anthony Wayne, . . . contains an account of negotiations with the Indians which culminated in the treaty of peace, signed at Greenville, Northwest Territory, August 3, 1795.] Ms. 62 leaves, obl. 8 vo. notebook.

The nineteenth century may well be the next great period to attract Americanists. East of the

Mississippi, it saw the beginning of reservation life and felt the pressure for Indian removal. For almost fifty years Indian Affairs were in the War Department, after that for the last century in Interior, and the Indian records in National Archives begin after the War Department fire of November 8, 1800. Lawyers and historians have used these records but not many anthropologists. The files of incoming letters down to 1830 are scant, but the bound volumes of Letters sent by the Secretary of War give a chronological record of Indian affairs, and register outgoing letters to persons whose papers we have seen in private archives: Israel Chapin (*père et fils*), Jasper Parrish, Callendar Irvine, and there are records of talks with Indian delegations—Cherokee and Iroquois. Red Jacket, Farmer's Brother, and others from Buffalo Creek visited Washington City at the turn of the century. Cornplanter and his half-brother, the Prophet, came down from Allegany in March of 1802, when the latter shared with Secretary Dearborn and the President the advice of the "Four Angels" who had appointed him to tell his people to give up fire water. The Seneca Nation, sick over loss of its lands, wanted a paper to guarantee title of remaining reservations. The President welcomed the suggestions and directed his Secretary of War, Henry Dearborn, to issue a passport to Handsome Lake and his associates, and a statement commending the new religion (Parker, 1919: 250). Here was official sanction for the new religion, and a printed copy of Dearborn's letter hangs in the Iroquois longhouses today whenever Handsome Lake's Code is recited (Deardorff, 1951).

Handsome Lake's prophecies were fulfilled and the worst happened. Missionary effort was to divide the Iroquois into Christian and Pagan factions and the State of New York kept up pressure for land cessions. Threat of Indian removal west of the Mississippi was to combine with land speculation to produce the scandalous Treaty at Buffalo Creek, 1838, which the New England Missionaries, the Society of Friends, and Indian interests were to fight through the courts and the legislative halls of Congress for another twenty years. The Indian public lost confidence in the life chiefs and deposed them when it was discovered that they had taken bribes and drinks to sign away all their reservations in western New York; all but Buffalo Creek and Tonawanda were restored in the compromise treaty of 1842. The latter treaty was never ratified in the Senate but was proclaimed by an incoming President.

The Senecas reacted to Buffalo Creek affairs by drafting a written constitution in 1833, which declared that any chief or headman who should drink . . . spirits should be deposed from his office (Foreman, 1946: 330). The Seneca Nation emerged as a constitutional government somewhat later in 1848 (Hargrett, 1947: 107). This reformation in Seneca politics was the work of the first generation of Indian scholars—Marius B. Pierce, alumnus of Dartmouth College, Peter B. Wilson, M.D., a Cayuga, and the brothers Nicholson H. and Ely S. Parker of Tonawanda, Indians, and the Reverend Asher Wright, missionary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign missions (Houghton Library, Harvard University).

The papers of Nicholson H. Parker, for many years U. S. Interpreter at Cattaraugus Reservation, and the literary efforts of General Ely S. Parker, his brother, who was afterward Commissioner of Indian Affairs, were used by Dr. Arthur C. Parker in a Seneca family history (Parker, 1919). The Huntington Library now has a substantial part of the Parker collection (1802–1846, 2 boxes). These comprise linguistic efforts of Asher Wright and his Indian students to prepare church materials in Seneca and to compile vocabularies in Seneca of various activities and interests. We have no better language materials today than Wright's manuscripts and his now rare ". . . Spelling Book in the Seneca Language" (Wright, 1842). The bulk of the Parker collection relates to treaty matters, land questions, memorials, and affidavits. But by far the most valuable materials to ethnology are N. H. Parker's "Census books of Tonawanda and Allegany Reservations for 1869," his "Census Book for Annuity Payments to the Seneca Nation 1855–1857," and a "List of Indians of the Six Nations who served in the war of 1812. . . ." The 1812 veterans are listed by Indian name first and clan affiliation, affording a nice roster of clan sets of personal names.

Other Parker materials recently acquired by the Library of the American Philosophical Society comprise some three hundred items which belonged once to Ely S. Parker, and were assembled after the first collection down to 1935 (A. C. Parker, p.c.) The Parker collection at the American Philosophical Society has been surveyed with the generous help of Dr. George S. Snyderman.

The first accessions to the Parker collection came several years ago after Dr. Arthur C. Parker loaned me a number of Asher Wright and Ely S.

Parker notebooks of council proceedings for study (Fenton, 1949a: 236). Perhaps the most interesting of the Asher Wright notebooks have not been previously called to the attention of ethnologists. Dr. Parker had these notebooks in mind when he urged me to collect clan sets of personal names in Seneca, when I first began field work in 1933. Asher Wright had made a Census of the Senecas at Buffalo Creek about 1840, which appears in two notebooks, measuring 10×17 cm., the first having some 46 pages extant, the last being separated and tipped in; and the second numbers 74 pages, many of which are blank. The census of 1840 lists "English names, Indian names, age, number of living children, number of children of school age, [whether] Pagan or Christian, Chief or Warrior, place of residence, and place of nativity." Persons are grouped by "Tribe" (clan) and by male heads of families, which will not yield composition of maternal families, but is quantitatively accurate for clan membership and their relative size. I believe that many of the names can be worked out from lists of personal names in my possession, with the help of living Seneca sources.

The present population of the Six Nations has more than doubled since the close of the Revolution when the Reverend Samuel Kirkland² totaled them at 4,647.

Kirkland, the previous year, had made a return of the Six Nations, with names, the heads of families and Tribes [Clans], village by village, from his missionary station at Oneida westward to Buffalo Creek. Like Wright, he lists Indian personal names with English translations, grouped by clan, village, and nation. He dated this draft of his census October 20, 1789, and a copy of this manuscript, which numbers nine pages and measures 8×13 inches, survives him in the Hamilton College Library. Taking this census had occupied Kirkland's attention for several years.

In the course of the summer of 1791 he completed "A Statement of the numbers and situation of the Six United Nations in North America," and sent a copy to the President of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, to which he recently had been elected a member. The best efforts of several persons have failed to find any trace of the Indian census in a Massachusetts repository.

From such available data and the later reports of

the Indian Commissioners, Dr. Snyderman hopes to prepare an analysis of Iroquois population growth from period to period.

Returning to the Parker Collection, the papers at the Huntington contain both earlier and later date lines, while most of the recent accession at the Library of the American Philosophical Society had belonged to Ely and relate to his boyhood, through schooling, his contacts with L. H. Morgan, the ethnologist, the struggle for the re-purchase of Tonawanda Reservation, and Ely's professional career as a civil engineer. The letters reveal Indian attitudes toward the whites and are chiefly valuable as evidence of the process of acculturation. The two collections supplemented by records in the National Archives of General Ely S. Parker's term as Commissioner of Indian Affairs in Grant's administration merit a new biography.

The letters of L. H. Morgan have important bearing on the history of American ethnology and will be of interest to future biographers. Morgan commenced his study of the Iroquois in 1841, and soon met E. S. Parker with whom he discussed the people on September 27, 1845, some six years before his book appeared (Fenton, 1941: 148-149). His field notes are preserved in the Rush Rhees Library, University of Rochester (Gilchrist, 1936). The meeting of Morgan and Parker was a happy coincidence. The Seneca chiefs, particularly the Tonawanda Band, found it difficult to convey their own political values to legal minded white men. Unanimity, which is the universal rule of consent in Indian councils, and not simple majority vote, was beyond the comprehension of white officials.

The chiefs tried to make this clear to the Secretary of War, James B. Porter, October 24, 1845. [We have] . . . "no law to force an Indian of the Seneca Nation. Our law is binding when every individual in the nation consents to it, and if anyone does not give their consent to a proposition that proposition is not binding upon them. This is the adopted principle and rule among the Seneca Nation of New York . . . a majority cannot rule" (Parker Papers, 33, American Philosophical Society). Therefore, the Tonawandas were not bound by the action of Buffalo Creek chiefs in selling the Tonawanda Reservation without their consent to the Ogden Land Company. The objection of a single chief acted like the veto, so familiar to us today from actions in the United Nations Security Council (Schoolcraft to Ely

² Kirkland, S., Missionary. December 24, 1790. A general statement of the Six Nations of Indians living within the United States (Manuscript) (Kirkland Papers, Hamilton College, Library).

Parker, May 7, 1846, Parker Papers, 51, American Philosophical Society). Majority rule came late.

Separation of civil and military powers was provided for in the Constitution of the League (Parker, 1916; Fenton, 1949). Tradition recounts constant struggle between the two forces from early times, and historically, the war chiefs got the upper hand during protracted wars with the whites. Consequently there were some eighty chiefs at Buffalo Creek after the Revolution and the names of few civil chiefs appear as signers of treaties. The Tonawanda people were trying to reestablish the power of the eight Federal Chiefs who traditionally represented the Seneca Nation in the League and are called Sachems in the literature when Morgan appeared on the scene looking for materials to found a New Confederacy, a fraternal order of white men with chapters or council fires in each of the principal cantons of the old League. Morgan's other first interest was place names (Morgan to Caroline Parker, May 28, 1846, Parker Papers, 53, American Philosophical Society). Early Morgan letters are signed Schenandoah or Tadodarhoh, the prime minister of the League. But he soon moved on from playing Indian chief to more serious scientific endeavors.

I wonder whether Morgan inserted the notes in the *Rochester Daily Democrat* (March 30, 1847) on the ceremonies of the Pagan Senecas who are reported to outnumber the Christians three to one. Their chiefs oppose a bill pending in the Assembly to induce them to elect officers. "Their ancient and modern custom has been, and is, to appoint their successor, who must be . . . in the blood of the last chief . . . , the issue of the female, let her marry whom she may."

Factions are a peculiar feature of American Indian political organization that has yet to be worked out for the country as a whole, and the history of factionalism among the Six Nations is fascinating. The Tonawanda Band in the bitter struggle to retain possession of their reservation found it difficult ". . . to be united in their plans and purposes . . . in this our last struggle for the homes and graves of our honored dead." So Ely wrote to brother Nicholson, June 21, 1846, from Washington where he was representing the group. Ely was but a lad of 18 in the jungle of lobbyists, and the old chiefs in the Tonawanda woods were fearful they had placed too much responsibility on young shoulders. So they wrote him suggesting sending down some older chiefs ". . . that the blame might not rest upon you so strongly if we

should happen to lose our lands . . ." (Blacksmith and Johnson, Tonawanda chiefs to Ely S. Parker, 78, American Philosophical Society). Evidently the Christian party promoted the idea of proportionate representation by factions, which was acceptable to other parties, and naming the delegation was deferred to a later council.

Ely S. Parker was tribal delegate to Washington the year that the Smithsonian Institution was founded; he met various great names of the day, and noted them in a diary, fragments of which survive (Parker, 1919: opp. p. 76) and Parker Papers, 76, American Philosophical Society). The 1847 Washington diary is obviously incomplete, and consists of eleven loose pages torn from a lined notebook, approximately 6 × 8 inches. A few excerpts give a picture of the city a century ago, which in some respects remains much the same today. While noticing all the splendor of the Presidential Mansion, on Saturday, January 2, 1847, the young Indian was annoyed by "enquiring gazes of the populace, who were wondering whether I might be a foreigner, or an Indian brave. . . ." Like all Indians he felt sympathy for his colored brethren, noting the White House slaves "had liberty from Christmas to New Year, . . ." He was entertained by Dolly Madison who proved a charming hostess, though nearly eighty; "we were most agreeably surprised to find her so young looking, so healthy and cheerful, and without retaining strong and evident traces of her former beauty. . . ." She and Ely discussed the plight of Indians at length, whether Quakers were true friends of Indians, and speculated on the number of possible descendants of John Smith, who was saved by Pocahontas, and Ely wonders how many of the latter "will risk his or her life for an Indian." The troubled status of his race confronted him even on Sunday when he ventured to attend the church of Dr. Sprole, and was directed to sit in the gallery. ". . . if such was to be my treatment in a house devoted to the worship of God, I had rather be elsewhere. . . ." Ely expresses an equally low opinion of drunken diplomats, politicians, and various and sundry hangers on whom he saw flee the fire at Jackson's hall on the cold day which commemorated Old Hickory's victory at New Orleans. And he met but few real statesmen in the Senate in whom he felt the Indians might place their trust.

L. H. Morgan was one such person, however, to whom the Indian leaders were beginning to look in confidence. The Hawk clan gave him one of its

honored names, which carried membership in an extended maternal family with corresponding loyalties and obligations to and from a host of persons. Morgan's legal training stood the Indians in good stead; his adoption he soon converted to the wider study of kinship. Morgan carried on a running correspondence with the Parker family, getting much material for his *League* in this way. But Caroline Parker confesses to failing him on paradigms. ". . . I did not know about Indian grammar so very well as he thought I did. Well it is better for a man to find out the truth than to be deceived" (Caroline G. Parker to Nicholson Parker, Tonawanda, February 28, 1847, Parker Papers 82 American Philosophical Society). Ely had a marked facility for putting ethnology on paper, particularly Indian speeches, the Handsome Lake Religion, council procedure, and ceremonies, which Morgan promises to print "almost word for word" (Morgan to E. S. Parker, 1848-1850, Parker Papers, Nos. 109, 112, 112A, 114, and especially 137). Ely's replies may be found in the Morgan Papers in Rochester, and the case for Ely's collaboration, which Morgan acknowledged in dedicating his *League* to Ely, is strengthened by the Parker Collection at American Philosophical Society (Parker, 1919: 79 ff; Fenton, 1941).

Morgan urged Ely to preserve speeches for himself. Ely kept his field notes, sending a second or third draft to Morgan who reworked it for his book. The Parker collection demonstrates the relationship nicely. Jimmy Johnson's version of Handsome Lake's message, which Morgan keenly sought, is much closer to the original in Parker's notes than in Morgan's book (Morgan, 1901: 1: 223-248). Morgan attended a mourning or Condolence Council at Tonawanda and heard Jimmy Johnson on the Religion of Handsome Lake, in October of 1845, and it seems to have been an annual event. The first version, of which he sent Morgan an English synopsis (Morgan Papers 1: no. 16), has been reprinted (Parker: 1919, 251-261). But Morgan, unable to attend the 1848 council at Tonawanda, wrote Ely to take down for him ". . . a fine record of the proceedings, . . ." particularly the speeches of Jimmy Johnson in full, even if the same as he took down in 1846, possibly the previous year. In return Morgan made professions of good intentions toward Ely's career as an engineer (Morgan to Parker, September 26, 1848, 109 American Philosophical Society, and December 29, 1849, 114 American Philosophical Society). It took Ely several months to send in

his report on this Council, for Morgan wrote several letters and was still waiting January 29, 1850 (Parker Papers, 112 A.P.S., 112A, 114 A.P.S.; Fenton, 1941: 149, 153), and the report finally reached Morgan in time to form the basis of the chapter on the "New Religion" in the book (Morgan to Parker, August 2, 1850, Parker Papers, 137 A.P.S.; Morgan, 1901: 1: 223 ff.). Besides the final draft which Parker sent to Morgan (Gilchrist 1936: 1, No. 1), we now have two earlier drafts:

1) "Account of Indian Council at Tonawanda . . . held on 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th [October, 1848] for the purpose of hearing again the religious code of the Iroquois Confederacy." [incomplete.] (Parker Papers, 95 A.P.S.)

2) Council [of] Six Nations, 4th October 1848 [MS. 10 x 16 cm., 32 pp. folded and pinned at left. in the hand of Ely S. Parker. Cf. Morgan, 1901, 1: 223, footnote 2.] [Parker Papers, A.P.S. Seneca Indian material.]

The latter manuscript came to the Library with various Asher Wright items from A. C. Parker in 1949; it is not identical with any published version known to the writer, although it clearly antecedes the draft from which Morgan wrote. I transcribed the manuscript and carefully checked the transcription with the original and with Morgan in January of 1948, and have noted passages which Morgan amplifies. It may be important to print this document for later scholars (see appendix).

Ely's rewards came in friendship and prestige. An old Washington contact, Daniel Webster, acknowledged a gift copy of "The League of the . . . Iroquois," which he had yet to read: "Your nation has always been of great interest to me, and any work which will give me an insight into their character, habits, manners and religion will be held in value by me." (Webster to Parker, 155 A.P.S., June 19, 1851.)

The Tonawanda Band elevated him to its most important office—Donihogä'wen', "Doorkeeper" of the Confederacy, which carries rank of Sachem, in the Wolf Clan. The *Buffalo Courier* ran a fine notice of the Condolence Council at which the Oneidas, Cayugas, and Tuscaroras condoled the death of John Blacksmith, chief, and put the "antlers of office" on Ely's head (Parker Papers, 160, 161, 166 in September of 1851).

Let us leave the description of library research materials at the point where Ely Parker left the reservation and ceased to be a prime ethnological

source on his people and turn to other considerations.

III

The development and renewed interest in Iroquois studies in recent years has contributed these subjects for doctoral dissertations, and publication has expanded. Some but not all of the expanded interest in northeastern ethnography may be laid at the door of the Iroquois Conference; a good deal of it has been appropriated, since the Conference exists to provide a forum for students of an area and to promote work on problems which its discussions generate. Examples of recent essays for the degree of Master of Arts include two participants at conferences on Iroquois studies, and one other who qualifies:

Polenz, Phillipa. "Some problems in the notation of Seneca dances" (M.A., Columbia, 1947).

Carse, Mary Rowell. "The Mohawk Iroquois" (M.A., Yale, 1947) (Carse, 1949).

Herman, Mary W. "A reconstruction of aboriginal Delaware culture from contemporary sources" (M.A., University of California, Berkeley, 1950) (Herman, 1950).

The number and scope of doctoral dissertations on the Iroquois and related subjects is even more striking. The latter includes subjects and persons who took an M.A. in the field and went on. Two dissertations pursue the same subject at different periods.

Snyderman, George S. "A sociological analysis of Iroquois Warfare" (Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, 1948) (Snyderman, 1949).

Scheele, Raymond. "Warfare of the Iroquois and their northern neighbors in the seventeenth century" (Ph.D., Columbia, 1949).

Lounsbury, Floyd. "Iroquoian morphology" (Ph.D., Yale, 1950) (Lounsbury, 1951).

Wallace, A. F. C. "The modal personality structure of the Tuscarora Indians: as revealed by the Rorschach Test" (Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, 1950) (Wallace, 1951).

Still another dissertation on Iroquois kinship by Harry W. Basehart is pending at Harvard.

Besides some titles already listed, several solid publications reporting earlier work, which have appeared recently, deserve notice. For its general significance to history, *The excavation of Ste Marie I* (Kidd, 1949); a last work and important ethnological contribution, *Midwinter rites of the Cayuga Long House* (Speck, 1949); a basic work on acculturation, *Law and government of the*

Grand River Iroquois (Noon, 1949); a biography of three dimensions—history, ethnology, psychology—*King of the Delawares: Teedyuscung 1700–1763* (Wallace, 1949); a description of a museum specimen, which called forth parallel studies in history, ethnology, linguistics, and political structure (Fenton, 1950a). Within the present year, Smithsonian Institution will reaffirm its stake in Iroquoian studies, going back to 1881, with publication of two major monographs (Wallace, 1951), and the Iroquois Symposium of 1949 (Fenton, 1951). Both contain introductory statements on earlier studies in the field.

IV

Needs and possibilities of fulfilling them are related to work already accomplished and warrant mention in a progress report. In approaching another conference on Iroquois studies, language, material culture, kinship, folklore of the treaty period, myth and history of Handsome Lake's religion, the history of the Seneca Nation and of the Grand River Iroquois—are topics which seem productive of new work and immediate results.

Topics selected should also have wide implications and interest several specialties so that a single theme will focus discussion and each session will attract persons of several disciplines. A study of dialect geography is well under way and can be presented so as to interest archeologists. A study of material culture in the museum and in the field, which is badly needed, will help the archeologist interpret his materials; so will a study of trade goods. Kinship happens to claim the attention of several specialists working just now in diverse places. The Indians have a considerable folk tradition of what took place at treaties, which no one has related to the claims now pending, nor have the lawyers found a way of using such lore which may have substantial basis in fact. I say this because Deardorff has shown how closely the Code of Handsome Lake adheres to what contemporary journalists record.

The Senecas of western New York have enjoyed self-government for a century, as have the Six Nations on Grand River. While the minute books of the Seneca Council remain in private hands, and fire often has consumed what inadequate care has not effaced, some records are preserved in libraries and the Nation has others. The Indian Office at Brantford, Canada, however, has stored in its basement Minutes of the Council of the Six Nations on Grand River reaching back

into the last century. These should be studied or at least calendared and filmed. Here are materials for a social history of factionalism, which could be supplemented by field work after the manner of Noon (1949).

New field work is always attractive, but repeated field work by the same or different persons gets results. Some work among the Cayuga Seneca of northeastern Oklahoma by someone already familiar with ceremonialism in Iroquoia, if undertaken soon, may catch the dying breath of the "three sisters" rites in "Indian Territory." I made some soundings there in June 1950, but fuller work could be done by one with fewer commitments.

Finally, the Iroquois and their neighbors cover a time span of three centuries and have had more written about them in the last hundred years than any other American Indian people, including the Navaho (Murdock, 1941: 109-115; Rouse and Goggin, 1948: 113-118). During three centuries their culture has undergone remarkable change which is abundantly documented; their culture has also demonstrated amazing stability. Theoretically, it seems more important to explain stability than to note the change.

V

Cross-cultural currents are felt beyond the limits of a field of studies through publication and exchange of persons. Those of us who labor in the Iroquoian field like to think that we advance knowledge and that what we do influences work elsewhere. Anthropologists are generally familiar with Kluckhohn's Navaho field work to which he repeatedly returns from forays into theory and development of new work in unknown areas. It would be difficult to say whether the Russian Research Center at Harvard or the Ramah Project among the Navaho has first claim on his affections, but the former undoubtedly has been influenced by methods developed in Navaho field work. This argument for prolonged concentration on the culture of an area is ably stated by Kroeber, in the Huxley Memorial Lecture of 1945: "The one proper foundation of all broader studies in ethnology as in history is the precise, intimate, long-continued examination of the culture of an area or a period. It is only upon such detailed examination that sound comparisons and wide inferences may legitimately be based" (Kroeber, 1945: 9).

Some notions about political structure and methods of field work, which the writer developed over

a long period of field and library study among the Six Nations, were this past year transferred to the study of Indian self-government and factionalism in three divergent tribal cultures—Taos, Klamath, and Blackfeet. Each field situation was unique and required an adjustment of techniques, but the main principles held. It remains to be seen whether an Iroquois broom sweeps Taos plaza clean, but future Iroquois studies will benefit.

The several Iroquois conferences have been constantly refreshed by participation of workers from other areas. De Laguna's name is linked to the Alaskan Northwest, but she has contributed the sharpest of insights to the discussion of Northeastern studies, both in ethnology and archeology. The Conference has also welcomed a Cornell group on two occasions whose main interest lay in the Southwest. Voget brought the focus on kinship studies from the Northern Plains to McGill University and began work at neighboring Caughnawaga.

VI

To list the universities, colleges, museums, libraries, and research institutions which have developed and sent scholars to the Iroquoian field, or to take part in the Conferences on Iroquois research, since 1945 would amount to a roster of our principal learned institutions between Boston and Chicago, and from Washington to Ottawa. Such information has appeared in the register of attendance published in the mimeographed *Proceedings of the Annual Conferences* (Fenton (ed.), 1949b). All of these institutions have contributed personnel and field funds to the work by supporting individual members of their own staff without benefit or hindrance from a formal organization. The will to meet annually and exchange ideas has been the guiding force. It would be amiss, however, not to mention our hosts, Honorable Charles E. Congdon, Chairman of the Allegany State Park Commission, and Merle H. Deardorff of Warren, Pennsylvania, who annually have invited the Conference to meet at Red House Lake and have contributed to the comfort and pleasure of their guests. Besides their own institutions and personal resources, projects of workers in the Iroquoian field have received support from the Viking Fund, Inc. and from the research funds of the American Philological Society. The development of anthropological studies in the northeastern area, for a fact, has been a vital part of the Society's Library program since 1947.

APPENDIX

Council [of] Six Nations 4th October 1848
[Ink at top]

[Ms. 10 × 16 cm., 32 pp. folded and pinned at left, appears to be in the hand of Ely S. Parker. See Morgan, *League*, I: 223 ff. and footnote 2, p. 223., containing account of same written from notes by E. S. Parker, taken October 4, 5, 6, 1848, at Tonawanda. Cf. A. C. Parker, *Life of Gen'l. Elv S. Parker*, p. 251-261, where revelation recital is dated October 2-3, 1845. The following does not appear to be identical.]

(Council Six Nats [illegible] [pencil]
Is 32 years since Prophet died . . .

It is now late in the day. [Let us?] thank the 4 angels & my Grandfather who knows for what I am this day laboring. I will now commence and want you all to pay good attention, & let what I say sink in your minds. I say this to exhort[?] Now then Listen Councillors, women & warriors. I will now commence but I am not able to commence(?) alike on all occasions[?] Oyikna he was yet sick [Cf. Morgan, I: 224.]

He had been sick 4 years. [He had been accustomed to tell us (*Ibid.*)] I had always resigned myself to G[reat] S[pirit] I daily returned my thanks to G S for the return of the [Sky or Stars(?)]/[Ms. p. 2]

[When] Night came I looked through my cabin & saw Stars what beauty [?] G.S. works. [*Ibid.*, 225 top, clarifies this passage.] I had thanks. I thought I could not live to see another Night & I therefore returned thanks. (Heretofore I have been [a] little [w]rong I now correct, though I am conscious I am yet imperfect.) It came to pass he saw he was growing worse. His daughter was in stoop [entry way to bark house] with [her] husband[?] He told her he wanted to see his relations—his brother Corn Planter & Blacksnake. He want[ed] to speak to them they were sent for and came soon.

Blacksnake went right up/
[Ms. p. 3]

& opened his bosom & found it to be yet warm. The dew was just getting dry. 1/2 way to Noon his heart began to beat. About noon he opened his eyes. Blacksnake spoke & asked him if he was in [his] right Mind! At noon he opened again & Blacksnake again asked him. he said he was. B. says what did you see. He says a Man came into [the] stoop & asked me to come out. I was sick & could not do it. I looked out and saw some men. I arose & went out, but stepping over the threshold I fell & they/[Ms. p. 4]/ caught me. They were 3 Holy Men, looked alike and dressed alike. Paint one day old. He said we come to help you. They had shrubs,

they said take fruit [?] drink [?]¹ & eat, this is Medicine. We come to see you, you are bad off, we understand how resigned you are to Great Spirit. How thankful &c. G. S. sees it all. You think often you cannot see another night. You thank to see, you thank to see stars, You think you can't live to see any more²—/[Ms. p. 5]/ We sent by G. S. He maid[sic] us his servants when he created earth & man. Since we have watched constantly night & day. One [of us] is not here. You may see him. He is gone to G.S. to tell him what is doing. G. S. thinks about man, that it is good for you to resign yourselves to him, this is good. He orders therefore you get well & use Medicine no more. You tell your relations to have a festival tomorrow at noon you shall see them. They did so they were faithful. At noon the people saw him coming, & again he met them./ [Ms. p. 6]

You must travel on earth again & you must have something to tell your relations. They are great sinners. This never happened before since creation. If it has happened men have gone astray, this will not be so. We say you are great sinners. G. S. did not intend it. You sin greatly in getting drunk. You must stop says G. Spirit, your creator. Your ancestors brought your misery on you. They sinned greatly & none of them have gone to heaven. It (alcohol) does not belong to you. It was made by G.S. for white man & he took [it] over the sea[?]/[Ms. p. 7]/ It is medicine for them, they must take it 3 times a day. So says G.S. But they pervert his law & break it. You must stop it & repent of it. It is possible with all to leave it. Old folks too. They can all repent—So he said they said. G.S. wants you to reform & bless your children. You have sinned too much, & pollute the earth his work. We will tell you four great things. G.S. never intended for Indian & now he tells you. At first, he intended all men to be meek & love one another. He kept to himself how long our Should[?] life [life should be; "withheld from man the number of his days" (Morgan, 227)]. He has made / [Ms. p. 8]/ a road for each in his life—

It is very wrong to be a witch. It is sinful & all must repent—Tell your relations. God never created such. They must repent. If they cant do it in public, it will be sufficient to tell you, we shall hear, if she cant do that let here[sic] make a secret repentance, we shall see and hear also G.S. Who sees all things, that will be sufficient. If they dont repent they have 2 deaths & 2 sicknesses (we think)

¹ Morgan writes (p. 226): "Each held in his hand a shrub bearing different kinds of fruit. One of them addressing me said, 'We have come to comfort and relieve you. Take of these berries and eat; they will restore you to health. . . .'"

² Morgan has "moon"; possibly.

Hell is a place of misery they get sick on Easter & in hell They cant go to heaven/[Ms. p. 9]/ in hell they are burnt to ashes & never pass out (we think) Tell your relations, that they must not say he is blessed, for he does this for all.

Great Sin G. S. never intended who[ever] married to deceive, but be faithful & obedient. *Onuhate* [?][enters] it is bad, it kills great marriage. G.S. says you must stop & repent Because when you repent, you die easy. This G.S. wants of you all. He made 2 lives, & intended to be married. intended to excel[?] to love one another. This is right.

Great Sin in violating G.S. will when made 2 lives & ordered to fill the earth/[Ms. p. 10]/ they should have children. So many, but they abuse themselves & great many can t[?] see children. Great Sin *this*—Mother takes daughter, because she suffers at delivery & gives medicine & destroys organs. She kills great many— G. S. says this must stop & repent. Some don't know when organs destroyed. They have hope to do good. Some want child when grow up & cant. She must adopt child & bring up as hers from her womb. This is right & good.

Another. Some will conclude to do good to all. this is right & good

[Ms. p. 11] Some are orphans, they may be dirty Give them something & tie up their clothes & rags, this is right & good G.S. will reward them—
/This is 4

We tell you chiefs Sin Great Sin in selling land. G.S. did not design lands should be sold. Therefore Great Sin, now only rese^{tn} [reservations] left. You must hold them in trust for children this is all it is right & good. Great sinner who sells, must not sell—

Great Spirit ordained marriage because it is great thing to bring up Children. Parents must contract if young have parents [Old people arrange marriage]. They must look for a match. This he ordained Old folks bring um[Them] together/[Ms. p. 12]/ If they cant agree, Old folks must settle. If they cant possibly agree, they may separate in friendship— If they get children they must be thankful to G.S. & kind to children— Old folks did right in this matter & G.S. renews them & wants Parents to give good instruction to children & teach them right & children must listen & obey. It is not right when Parents commence talking for child to be obstinate & break in & say I will have my way. This is rong [sic]. It makes Parents feel bad & poor & will make them shed tears & we think it is hard, it/[Ms. p. 13]/ will drive many to hell. It burneth[?] minds. This is reason he now talks & exhorts to repent & wants marriage to go smoothly. When they are separated by death, this is good because she has been faithful. Children when grow up must be married & get grandchildren, it will make grandparents so happy— They must be supported. They will depend on you because strong. This G. S. ordains. Children must

not abuse parents or their old ancestors. G. S. says love & revere them.

[Ms. p. 14]

When children get married & do well, they must visit their parents, it makes[the]parents so happy, this is right.

It is wrong to throw away your children. When folks part great many things are said. Very bad, they get child & part Mau marries again & gets another child & parts this is very great sin. You must leave more than twice. If you [] we dont know that they can see G. Spirit. He says this must not be. You must take care your children ..

Again—They said it is wrong to be a bad Mother in Law/[Ms. p. 15]/ Old woman must not give bad instructions to her daughter to abuse her husband— This wrong & must be stopped. Says G.S. Husband & wife love one another.

Another Great Sin to commit adultery Wrong to be selfish & to get more than share. This must be stopped for it is wrong, says G.S. He sets bad example. Young folks will follow.

Sometimes when married, Parents quarrel over children. This is wrong Children hear & understand, & sometimes feel bad & conclude to go home & then parents feel bad/[Ms. p. 16]/ This must be stopped says G.S.

It is you understand our rule to stop at Noon the forepart Day is Gods. latter part day belongs to departed. Recollect what I have said respecting marriage. I thank you all for your attendance, Counsellors, warriors & women. At this time of day I return thanks. [Cf. Morgan, p. 230 mid.]

Webster spoke & returned thanks to preacher, and says that it is custom to do so & they must submit [? suspend] Very thankful what they heard Counsellors shook the hands of Johnson Grand High Priest /[Ms. p. 17]/returning thanks

Webstr. spoke return thanks & gave notice that all join in a festival of joy & praise to Great Spirit

Then come the Grand religious Dance [Great Feather Dance] and then the feast

Translated to this place [ink]³

Oct 5th Opened by Webster a Thanksgiving Speech—to G.S. Prophet, Warriors, women & children—

Speech Johnson.—Relations uncover your heads. At this time of day we again meet as several nations around council fire. My counsellors are around me, regularly appointed Thanks have been returned to G.S. He now sees us gathered & hears us. This he loves to see. good to one another. Let us be kind

³ It is evident that from these rough notes was transcribed a fuller account of the proceedings from which Morgan wrote the account in the *League*. Webster is probably the Onondaga speaker of the period, and Johnson is, of course, *Soshe'owaa*, "Great burden strap," Handsome Lake's grandson of Tonawanda, Jemmy Johnson.

to one another. It is near noon, I must stop at noon/[Ms. p. 18]/ You again see me as you prayed yesterday. G.S. has preserved lng [long?] life. I am grateful. I return thanks to G.S. to see you all to day. G.S. has preserved your lives.

I salute 4 Angels. I shall relate what they revealed. I salute my Grandfather. He used to preach what I am about going to say. I occupy his place. I salute G.S. This is right. I commence, Counsellors chiefs warriors & women, Listen to good instruction. I entreat to understand and consider how much GS says we have sinned.

He first prohibits drunkenness. This is now earrried on by some. It displeases G.S. I will commence now— They said it was not right to dispute between married people when child is laying between them. Child is just from G.S. & pure & hears & feels bad & goes home. Great many children die in this way. They said it was a great sin when child born, & seem to love great deal, & woman grows jealous & loves too much. G.S. says wrong & must repent. This they said—

Again they say, it is wrong to commit adultery. He designed to have villages. Man goes one village to another & soon inquires about women. That is wrong & must stop says G.S.

Sometimes man go hunting in woods gone great while, come baek find wife got another husband this is wrong must stop says G. Spir/[Ms. p. 19]/

Again they say it is rong when woman got ehild to punish much Must not strike or whip. This is rong. G.S. did not intend so. Must use water to punish. This is not wrong. Plunge under water, ehild says be good, then stop. It is rong to punish after repen[t] So they said. Again it was indended Man should not know the number of his days. Some do not live at all[?]. Some live little, difference in folks, when folks die, it is good to look at (the) dead close to face & talk what they intend to do that survive & that they may meet hereafter. Dead will hear. So they said. (Nowadays we do not do so. It is bad.)

Listen Counsellors, I commence what they said G.S. made for/

[Ms. p. 20]/ folks one earth, Amusements to folks— because he want all good on earth & every thing to grow so long earth lasts. This he wants. On surface ground grow berries. When ripe folks must praise God & thank him with amusement. Again G.S. made all we live on & wants all to be thankful for it. When it produces Men must thank & praise God. This he wants & ordained. Children must be first. Their[sic] is Grand Religious dance. Feast must consist of Green things. Their names, when got no names, must first proclaim. Must continue 4 days, so they said—

Grand religious first till noon not after. Next day Grand Thanksgiving till Noon [refers to Gonec'q,

Drum Dance]. Next day thunder[?] Songs [Personal Chant?]. Next day/[Ms. p. 21]/ betting all till noon—Again, we must salute Grandfather[s], they attend to all earth & what we live on, [the] Thunder Song is theirs & tobacco— Again, what we live on we must thank because we are related. The Earth is our Mother. It must be day when we thank what we live on & their Sisters. It must not be night.

Listen, Again what G.S. wants. We have cold. This is because men must hunt to live upon & dress [or *dance*?] amuse themselves 5 day February must commence Grand Festival last 3 [8?] days. All my ceremonies must be performed, through the village. If person want anything they can do then. [Dream obligations.] First day Children Grand religious dance. Proclaiming names/ [Ms. p. 22]/ carry children through village, So they say. 3 days up there feast to G.S. [Copyist's mark] 3 days more thanks to G.S. Last day Thunder [Adonwen' ?] Lastly our live upon [Tonwisas]—All done in Day [time]—This is Counsellors duty. G. S. made it—

Again let me tell you what happened when we began to hear 4 angels saw us all, & saw what was going on. Prophet Looked from above when he saw as if a crowd, out of it came a naked man, all hanging on & muddy. they asked him what he thought, he said hard. They said he was drunkard whiskey did it. Again he saw come 2 women naked. weeds shining out of hole. he said he saw, and thought hard. They say you said women know onuhate—[*onoiet*, love magie] / [Ms. p. 23]/

They aint fit to go into crowd So they said. They said watch & look He saw man, meat in both hands. They say look at that he say[w] a woman sitting gathering all things about her He thought hard. They say she is stingy. She cant spare anything She never can leave. So it happens Again they said tis wrong we hear some say liquor is not bad tis in food, we think they had better try it. Let drunkards hold council & opposite opposed to drunkards. let them have feast. Soon the drunkards have fuss. Great difference. Its bad. Some think they stop when they begin to die— this is rong, if they dont repent when they die, they never can/[Ms. p. 24] be eured by medieine. G.S. will not help. he is lost So they said.—

I do not speak all— I am sorry. They said Look on earth he saw Some water on Earth. They asked if he saw he said he did. He thought it human blood. They say it will be so if person dont stop drinking Brother kill brother when drunk, Sober he finds killed. We think this will be so they said.

Again we see costly house, white folks. He saw jail & Fetters & rope & whip all he saw. They say we think drunkard feels this they dont stop. So it happened. G.S. says therefore stop So they said And it is happened.—

Again see how many parties, he see meetings great many all dont want good instruction/[Ms. p. 25]/they like drink. Again see another meeting men & women all mixed.—

All dont want good instruction, they have wandered again See Meeting. They Say So many they are half inclined half stop drink So they said.— Again see Meeting, they say so many want good instruction to flourish we love them.— You are split up, we see it all, so they said— You got great many needs [words?]. Friends meet & tell one another how much they will do, we love[?] such. Again we see another 2 friends talking, they disagree, [which?] is hard, to disagree they must separate, cant go together So they said—Persons disagree cant go walk together.—/[Ms. p. 26]

They saw that man ever displeasing G.S. They say we think a great many will perish to G.S. law of having sold[?] & water & Fire. May freese [sic], drown & burn all drunkards. So they told us, it is happened our relations how many freese, drown & burn—They said great deal against liquor[?]. They said if person dont stop drinking we think they will yet be alive when punishm[ent] will[?] begin to torment the[m] this is so

Again—When dont do right they are put in jail. You must not steal it is rong. It is rong to be proud & vain. G.S. all persons must praise & thank me for what they hav All men created equal, but different in property &c—/

[Ms. p. 27] & Mind this was intended by G.S. Prophet was rejected at Cold Spring. He concluded to go to Tonawanda to his[?] relations my mother is buried, I will go & be buried by, hr[her?]. Angels said it was hard. We told you that they would reject you, we know you want to go to Tonawanda, we are willing & wish you well, we will not leave, for we think it to be true that we are sent by God, we will go with you, & if you are left alone we will not leave you. It was customary to have dances when he preached appointed a day for he knew when the angels came—He said X [copyist's mark in ink] at one time that they told him You dont know what is doing above the brothers are having a great dispute/[Ms. p. 28]/

Devil tells G. S. he owns all Earth, They all talk of me. they call me God & you Devil Your Creator says, it is mine. I made, you did not help me. I made man, you did not help me. It is mine for I made all things for Man So . G.S. says Your Creator thinks He will bring from Earth his part[?] of[?] They say tell your folks that tell Counsellors be strong we are afraid Devil go to Earth & take fiddle & cards. Put folks on guard, let the Counsellors be vigilant & keep G.S. law good. His law is as lasting as the Earth [?] So they said./[Ms. p. 29]

When religious gatherings & folks go to meet Devil runs & whispers in ear not to go. He says You may do this, He follows to door & sometimes bring back & stops out of doors. Sometimes in doors he wont let them dance. This is so.—Again they said it is great sin to be tale bearer. It grows upon them. A person says such a one says so of you . She tells another & it grows till it is very large when it gets home. This must be stopped & repent says G.S. When anyone wishes repent, let them think of G.S. & do so. If person says bad of another think of G.S. & keep still this is right. It must be repented off all days of life. So much for this—/[Ms. p. 30]/

Folks say look to East. Did you see Party[?] I did what you think

He saw as far could reach the rising of steam, these were from distillings, they cant be drunk up

Again our brother Little Beard wanted to do right always. He sent word by[the] Prophet his father what he yet lacked of good. They sent word back that they had heard. He was a hard man he had 2 minds, he must have but one. It is not good to have 2 for we have had 1 given us. When Prophet died he embraced Christian religion. This proved he had 2 minds. They saw great ways in future.—Again it happened I may be wrong They say look to Buffalo. It was once a/[Ms. p. 31]/ [very dim] fine settlement, good dancing house. He saw a settlement done[?] Long since lived there, high weeds[?] Look Buffalo He saw Ground[?] [?] loose, nothing solid We fraid commence[?] there to go wrong. This has happened They have said great many things happened.

Again—look to Allegany. He looked at Cold Spring & saw a great council ["Entered[?] Parker," written in ink vertically over the pencil script, evidently by Ely Parker when he had transcribed the note book.] & aged[?] Man a great many boats filled with[?] barrls[?] whiskey He was [told?] What you see is Devil who commenced work since you went away They said liquor was not made for Indians[?] X

Councillors, Chiefs, warriors & women[?] I rest, I thank you & Great Spirit preaching I got one day [more] I want you to come early. I come early.

[End]

REFERENCES

- CARSE, MARY R. The Mohawk Iroquois. *Bull. Archeol. Soc. Conn.* 23: 3-53.
 DEARDORFF, M. H. 1951. The religion of Handsome Lake: Its origin and development. In Fenton (ed.), Symposium on local diversity in Iroquois culture. *Bur. Amer. Ethnol. Bull.* 149. In press.
 FENTON, W. N. 1941. Tonawanda longhouse ceremonies: ninety years after Lewis Henry Morgan. *Bur. Amer. Ethnol. Anthropol. Pap.* 15, *Bull.* 128: 140-166.

- . 1949. Seth Newhouse's traditional history and constitution of the Iroquois Confederacy. *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* **93** (2) : 185-206.
- . 1949a. Collecting materials for a political history of the Six Nations. *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* **93** (3) : 233-238.
- (ed.). 1949b. Proceedings Fourth Conference on Iroquois Research, October 8-10, 1948, Allegany State Park, Red House, N. Y. Issued for the Conference by the Smithsonian Institution. March 15. (Mimeograph)
- . 1950. [Second Report of Progress.] *Yr. Bk. Amer. Philos. Soc.* for 1949: 186-188.
- . 1950a. The roll call of the Iroquois Chiefs: a study of a mnemonic cane from the Six Nations Reserve. *Smithsonian Misc. Coll.* **111** (15).
- (ed.). 1951. Symposium on local diversity in Iroquois culture. *Bur. Amer. Ethnol. Bull.* **149**. In press.
- FOREMAN, GRANT. 1946. The last trek of the Indians. Univ. of Chicago Press.
- GILCHRIST, DONALD B. 1936. Manuscript journals and record of Indian letters by Lewis Henry Morgan in the Rush Rhees Library: a descriptive table of contents. Univ. of Rochester.
- HARGRETT, LESTER. 1947. A bibliography of the constitutions and laws of the American Indians. Harvard Univ. Press.
- HERMAN, MARY W. 1950. A reconstruction of aboriginal Delaware culture from contemporary sources. *Kroeber Anthropol. Soc. Paps.* **1** : 45-77.
- HEWITT, J. N. B. 1944. The Requickenning Address of the Iroquois Condolence Council. W. N. Fenton (ed.). *Jour. Washington Acad. Sci.* **35** : 301-315.
- KIDD, K. E. 1949. The excavation of Ste. Marie I. Univ. of Toronto Press.
- KROEBER, A. L. 1945. The ancient Oikoumene as a historic culture aggregate. *Jour. Royal Anthropol. Inst.* **75** (1-2) : 9-20.
- LOUNSBURY, F. G. 1951. Comparative Iroquoian morphology. Supplement to *Language* (Jour. Ling. Soc. Amer.). In press.
- LOWRIE, W., and M. ST. C. CLARKE. 1832. American State Papers: Indian Affairs. 2 v. Washington.
- MANLEY, H. S. 1932. The treaty of Fort Stanwix 1784. Rome, N. Y., Rome Sentinel Co.
- MORGAN, L. H. 1901. League of the Ho-de'-no-sau-nee, or Iroquois. H. M. Lloyd (ed.). 2 v. N. Y.
- MURDOCK, G. P. 1941. Ethnographic bibliography of North America. Yale Anthropol. Studies 1. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press.
- NOON, J. A. 1949. Law and government of the Grand River Iroquois. *Viking Fund Pubs. in Anthropology* **12**.
- PARGELLIS, S. McC. 1933. Lord Loudoun in North America. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press.
- PARKER, A. G. 1916. The Constitution of the Five Nations. *N. Y. State Mus. Bull.* **184**.
- . 1919. The life of General Ely S. Parker. *Buffalo Hist. Soc. Pub.* **23**.
- ROUSE, I., and J. M. GOGGIN. 1947. An anthropological bibliography of the Eastern Seaboard. *Eastern States. Archeol. Fed. Res. Pub.* **1**. New Haven, Peabody Museum.
- SNYDERMAN, G. S. 1949. Behind the tree of peace: a sociological analysis of Iroquois warfare. *Bull. Soc. for Pa. Archaeol.* **18**.
- SPECK, F. G. 1949. The midwinter rites of the Cayuga Long House. Phila., Univ. of Penna. Press.
- WALLACE, A. F. C. 1949. King of the Delawares: Teedyuscung 1700-1763. Phila., Univ. of Penna. Press.
- . 1951. The modal personality structure of the Tuscarora Indians: as revealed by the Rorschach Test. *Bur. Amer. Ethnol. Bull.* **150**. In press.
- [WRIGHT, ASHER] 1842. Go'wānā gwa'is sat'hañ Yon de'yās dah' gwañ. A spelling book in the Seneca Language: with English definitions. Buffalo Creek Reservation Mission Press.

IROQUOIS ARCHEOLOGY AT THE MID-CENTURY*

JOHN WITTHOFT

Pennsylvania State Anthropologist

ON October 5, 6, and 7, 1950, the Sixth Conference on Iroquois Research met at Allegany State Park, in Cattaraugus County, New York, as guests of the Allegany State Park Commission. Previous conferences had consisted of professional and amateur students of all phases of Iroquois life, and the group had met as one body to discuss various approaches to a deeper knowledge of Iroquois ethnology and archeology.¹ The great virtues of these meetings were the informal nature of the papers and discussions, and the consideration of problems in all fields by a mixed group of ethnologists, archeologists, and historians. The fragmentation of the field into separate disciplines was avoided, and the essential unity of Iroquoian anthropology maintained in a group of specialists with quite divergent interests. The archeologist might be drawn as deeply into a discussion of Onondaga personality studies as into a discourse on Mohawk pottery types. The various facets of a science as applied to a single area and field were considered as a unity, and these meetings seemed to answer in part the problem of the progressive breakdown of communication between physical anthropologists, historians, archeologists, ethnologists, linguists, and students of personality.

In 1950 we divided the meeting into two concurrent programs, one centered about archeology, one about ethnology. This seemed necessary because of certain failures in the program based on an integrated view of Iroquois studies, but the split program lacked the broad scope of earlier meetings. Some other solution is needed, in the future, to the problem of a single meeting which can give equal emphasis to each discipline concerned with

the study of Iroquoian communities. This problem was largely a practical one at the Iroquois conferences, but is of wide significance rather than a local difficulty. Some discussion of this shortcoming may explain the division of the 1950 meeting and suggest the type of community of scholarship engaged in Iroquois research.

Membership at the meetings has always included more specialists in archeology than in other fields, and this disparity has been reflected in the greater part of the discussion devoted to archeology at all but the First Conference. As in other parts of the Eastern Woodlands, archeology in the Iroquois area is better financed than ethnology. A larger personnel spend a larger research time on archeological problems. Amateur students and collectors are more numerous and their time, energy, and mentality are valuable resources to the professional. Despite the fact that archeological research is generally more expensive than ethnological field work, trained observers in archeology seem to be increasing at the expense of their brethren. Ideally, the two disciplines should be as the faces of a coin, complementary points of view of a single intellectual endeavor, but their divergence has become increasingly conspicuous in recent years. The emphasis on their common ground and interrelationships has been a basic theme of the Iroquois Conference.

In many respects both archeology and ethnology seem to be separating more from this essentially conservative view of their roles. Ethnologists show less interest in material culture and more old-fashioned subjects, while extending their research into borderline fields which greatly enlarge the scope of their studies. The training of an ethnologist has become an increasingly difficult and subtle business, with great concentration in techniques and approaches drawn from non-anthropological science, and less attention to linguistic techniques and the whole fields of prehistory and human biology. Archeology in the Eastern Woodlands has come to a much later maturity, and is still in the throes of a complete reintegration. Increasingly elaborate field and laboratory techniques are ap-

* Research was carried out with the aid of a grant from the Phillips Library Fund of the American Philosophical Society.

¹ Mimeographed Proceedings of previous conferences were prepared by William N. Fenton. The first was issued and distributed by the Allegany State Park Commission (1945), the second (1946) and fourth (1948) by the Smithsonian Institution. The third was issued for the Conference by Peabody Museum, East India Marine Hall, Salem, Massachusetts. I wish to acknowledge my use of notes prepared at the meetings by Margaret Blaker of the United States National Museum.

plied to the elucidation of more specific and limited problems, and interpretations are not always at a high level of generalization. Each archeological project seems to require new applications of technique and the elaborate description and comparison of many details of material culture before very significant conclusions can be drawn. Since archeologists are dealing entirely with Iroquois studies in progress, with projects far from completion, the broad meanings of Iroquois archeology are at present hard to discern.

Because of the larger number of archeologists present and because of the primarily data-gathering stage of their work at the present time, earlier conferences were too largely devoted to discussion of their topics. In some cases discussion of ethnological and historical topics was abbreviated because one subject, prehistoric material culture, had taken so much time. The archeologist, on one hand, could often see little relevance of the ethnologist's work to his own research, and realized all too well the difficulty of projecting contemporary Iroquoian community studies onto archeological sites. On the other hand, the ethnologist was impressed with the apparently myopic view of the archeologist, and his preoccupation with pottery types, stylistic distinctions, and restricted theoretical frameworks, all involved in time-consuming discussion. The geographical extent of the Iroquoian ethnologists' field is limited by the number of Iroquoian-speaking communities, but Iroquoia is a realm of unknown bounds to the archeologist. The difficulty of deciding what archeological data are pertinent to Iroquois studies and the sparsity of good information from Five Nations sites led to the introduction of much material which seemed totally irrelevant to many non-specialists, again at great expense of discussion time. An increasing emphasis on archeology at each annual conference led to the adoption of a split program with the hope that one meeting devoted completely to archeology could clear enough ground to permit a more balanced program at future meetings.

Spatial and temporal limits in extinct material culture which correspond in degree and magnitude to surviving linguistic and cultural distinctions do not exist in the Northeast. Attempts to define a complex which we can label "Iroquois" and can contrast with definitions labeled "Delaware," "Fort Ancient," etc., have so far met with failure. The archeologist seems to be laboring with the material culture equivalents of the linguist's isoglosses and

sub-dialects, rather than with distinctive culture complexes of the order of language families and languages. Empirically (judging by the study of archeological materials in context from properly conducted excavations) the most minute details in form, decorative style, and technology of archeological objects were culturally bound, and free variation is often hard to detect by even the most microscopic study of very large samples. Several distinct sub-traditions may be found in the same community complex, but each had very limited geographical and temporal existence. Relationships between these numerous and sharply delimited stereotypes are hard to discover. Successive styles in the same area may resemble one another closely, yet intermediary forms which connect them are known only as small samples from minor sites, and seem to represent revolutionary transitions; the melting of one cultural mode, a moment of flux, and the freezing of new and old traits into a new stereotype. Each of these stereotypes, as represented by pot types, pipe styles, bone tool types, burial forms, and other material culture traits, was not restricted to one community or yet co-extensive with any large segment of Iroquoia. In many cases it appears certain that complexes of such minor stereotypes characterized tribal groups or social units of equal size at specific time periods (one or more generations in duration), and that such complexes varied with time, space, and socio-political organization.

Interrelationships between neighboring complexes of this type are apparent yet do not generally present a rational pattern. The total of such blocks of traits (each made up of details contemporaneous in one social group) does not present a set of common equivalents which we can call Iroquois. Neither does such a block always contrast more, with a similar complex from a nearby non-Iroquoian community, than with other complexes of Iroquoian-speaking peoples. Mohawk material may resemble Mahican and Munsee more than it does Onondaga or Susquehannock. Both Erie and Andaste-Susquehannock appear to have adopted shell-tempering in pottery from a non-Iroquoian (?) culture of the upper Allegheny Valley, but it is difficult to distinguish other ceramic and non-ceramic culture traits which were transferred in the same period. Specific pottery decorative motifs which developed in Andaste-Susquehannock communities of the late prehistoric period were adopted by Munsee and by a poorly-known culture of the upper Allegheny Valley, yet other evidence of in-

fluence between these groups is tenuous. Mohawk and Onondaga contrast much more strongly in bone-tool types than in pottery. Seneca and Cayuga seem closely related by linguistic and ethnological criteria, yet their fossil material cultures represent quite distinct traditions. Their styles are intermingled in some early historic sites in a puzzling fashion, and are found separate in others; they do not appear to have modified one another in later Seneca and Cayuga sites. Onondaga sites in New York seem to give one of the clearest pictures of a complex coextensive with a tribal unit, and of the origin and development of this tribal culture. Canadian archeology, however, presents us with two close relatives of Onondaga material culture in other areas, with detailed inconsistencies which prevent any reasonable interpretation of all three at the present time. Huron material culture appears as the tremendously abundant product of a dense population, occupying a large culture-area of the Iroquoian speaking world in the late prehistoric period; its antecedents are either unknown or not yet recognized.

A three-dimensional study of late prehistoric and historic cultural materials from the whole of the Five Nations-Huron area and some of its borders is still the main desideratum to future knowledge of Iroquois prehistory. Knowledge of geographical distributions of cultural assemblages and careful segregation by time levels are equally essential to this program. The difficult problem of Iroquois culture areas first presented itself as a major question at the Third Iroquois Conference (1947). After the conference, eight participants, representing eight distinct regions of the area centered about the Five Nations in the United States and Canada, met for four days at Rochester in discussion of Iroquois and Huron pottery types and their distributions.² Richard S. MacNeish had been engaged for nearly a year in the study of collections already in existence, and the meeting was in part a stock taking of available data.³ Mohawk, Onondaga, Seneca, Huron, and Susquehannock seemed to admit characterization at several different time periods. An evolutionary series of pottery types, on a tentative basis, was possible for

each on the basis of data available. Cayuga and Oneida were poorly known, but preliminary statements about their archeological characteristics in the early historic period were possible. Erie, Neutral, and some other groups known to history were not certainly identifiable anywhere in the archeology. A host of related archeological complexes, Uren, Laurentian Iroquois, and others known from one site or a poorly defined area, represented archeological complexes of equal order which did not fit any accepted Huron-Iroquois classification. Other complexes, like Munsee, Mahican, Fort Shantok of eastern Long Island and adjacent New England, and the poorly known complexes west and south of the Seneca country showed very suggestive and sometimes very close resemblances to assemblages from Iroquoian-speaking communities, yet at least some of these represented communities which spoke non-Iroquoian languages.

In the fall of 1947 the American Philosophical Society called a meeting of American anthropologists to discuss future projects in which the Society might participate. At this gathering a strong alliance between the Society and the Iroquois Conference was reinforced, and the two bodies have since contributed in complementary fashion to progress in Iroquois studies. The area of interest was defined as that east of the Mississippi and north of the Virginia-Maryland line, with Oklahoma as an extension, since that state included transplanted peoples from the northeastern area. A program of research in the anthropology of this region was in part an extension of the Society's pioneer American Indian research, and of later studies based on the Boas Collection, and was to be pursued as activity parallel to, rather than substitute for, these older projects. Field research since sponsored by the American Philosophical Society has emphasized many phases of Iroquoian anthropology, and some of the most rewarding discussion at the Iroquois Conferences has been based on field work financed and aided by the Society. Archeological research on Iroquois problems in three states and in two Canadian provinces is included in the series of projects sponsored by the Society, and the Society has aided local archeologists in many other ways. Even more conspicuous contributions to Iroquois ethnology and linguistics by the Society have likewise constituted an oblique but important aid to Iroquois archeology.

At the Fourth Iroquois Conference (1948), the archeological portion of the conference was pre-

² The Committee on Iroquois Ceramics, which met on October 27, 28, and 29 at Rochester. William A. Ritchie kept the minutes at these sessions.

³ MacNeish's survey was sponsored by the Indiana Historical Society and the Museum of Anthropology of the University of Michigan. His report will be published in *American Antiquity* in the near future.

sented in two parts, one a series of brief progress reports by persons engaged in field work, and one a round table discussion led by James B. Griffin. This discussion had, as its major purpose, the definition of an Iroquoian archeological area. While the Five Nations-Huron area was not characterized by a single complex, the direct historical approach here permitted outlines of a number of more or less related complexes of the late prehistoric period which pertained to Iroquoian communities. These, with closely related archeological cultures nearby, made up the field in which archeological problems were relevant to Iroquoian studies; cultures of nearby areas which contrasted with these were not a part of the archeologist's Iroquoia. Closely related cultures of non-Iroquoian speaking areas adjacent were included as relevant to the question of Iroquoian prehistory, even though these cultures were of a different linguistic pedigree. The absence of complexes in other areas which closely resembled any of the northern Iroquoian complexes was emphasized. This discussion indicated that the Iroquoian archeological culture area included: the Five Nations area in New York; the upper Susquehanna Valley; the Erie, Neutral, and Tobacco areas of northwestern Pennsylvania, northeastern Ohio, western New York, and parts of Ontario; Huronia and adjacent areas to the north, of unknown extent; the Saint Lawrence Valley, with northeastern New York, and Vermont; the Hudson Valley and the upper Delaware Valley, which show close relationship to the Mohawk and upper Susquehanna; southern New England, where closely related trends can be seen in later periods. These each permit subdivision, and each includes several distinct archeological complexes which were apparently contemporaneous. They are listed here as convenient geographic divisions rather than as sub-cultural areas. These subdivisions embrace all of the area in which archeological research is directly involved with Iroquoian prehistory; perhaps the area will be extended when studies reach a greater depth in time, but at present this region includes everything directly relevant to the archeology of Iroquoian-speaking communities. The area was defined in discussion by an attempt to encircle it with unrelated and contrasting culture areas of late prehistoric—early historic times. Conspicuous in discussion was the uneven knowledge available of various sub-areas within this region, and a good deal of field work since the Fourth Conference was devoted to the conspicuous gaps in our spatial and

temporal picture of Iroquoian archeology pointed out in this meeting.

The 1950 Iroquois Conference included a larger group of Iroquoian archeologists than previous meetings, and this assembly represented the first meeting of northeastern archeologists, professional and amateur, to include spokesmen from almost every part of the Iroquoian area. Almost every individual participated in the first part of the program, in which statements of present concepts of culture complexes, and their distribution and history in each local area, were presented by representatives and enlarged upon by their associates. This discussion was limited to historic Iroquoian sites and their extensions back into prehistoric time. Such peripheral but important areas as southern New England, the Hudson and Delaware Valleys, and northern Quebec were treated as marginal to Iroquoian centers, and no major attention was given to them. The later part of the program was spent on more detailed presentation of parts of the earlier program which seemed most rewarding, and included more complete descriptions and comparisons of cultural material, illustrated by lantern slides and specimens. My summary of the discussions does poor justice to the scope and high quality of these reports. This summary is not in order of presentation, but has been recast to fit better a geographical and cultural outline. It is not fully documented by references to the literature, since almost every contribution to Iroquoian archeology occupied some place in the background of the discussion.

William A. Ritchie, P. Schuyler Miller, and Donald Lenig began the discussion with summaries of present ideas about Mohawk archeology. Miller's brief statement of the history of Mohawk investigations carried Iroquois archeology back nearly to its beginning, and related the present renaissance in this field to earlier developments. Extensive clearing of new land for wheat during the Civil War made possible the discovery and field examination of large numbers of important sites, by local students and collectors, on a scale not possible before or since. The very large samples of archeological material collected during this period made possible the first important formulation of site differences and the first sense of time levels. Mohawk sites of differing types were recognized, they were ascribed dates, and serious efforts were made to identify some of them with towns of the historic period. By 1900 a great deal of digging had been done on many of these sites, and historic documen-

tation appeared satisfactory for a number of them. Plausible interpretations seemed to come with decreased local interest in Mohawk problems. Recent years have seen a strong shift from this period of lessened activity and certain conclusions. Most of the time-honored documentations are queried, and field research is being extended to obtain refined data from as many sites as can be discovered. Awareness of problems and an open-minded search for evidence are the major characteristics of this local revival. The Van Epps-Hartley Chapter of the New York State Archeological Association, the Mohawk-Caughnawaga Museum at Fonda, and the New York State Museum are currently pursuing a program of Mohawk studies which should make this area one of the best understood in the Eastern Woodlands.

Donald Lenig's report was based mainly on scriation studies of site survey collections, with emphasis on comparative chronology of sites and the tracing back of Mohawk culture to deeper time depths. His hypotheses agreed well with a sequence presented at the Fourth Iroquois Conference by Richard S. MacNeish, and his studies are closely integrated with Ritchie's work on Mohawk prehistory. Lenig and Ritchie described Mohawk as a quite restricted industry, with only pottery abundant and with few types of bone and stone tools and pipes. Probably the majority of objects in everyday use were made of perishable materials. Therefore much of the present interpretation of Mohawk sites is based upon ceramics. A good chronological picture of Colonial sites, derived from trade goods and from whole cultural inventories, is not yet available, but pottery seriation studies indicate the relative position of some sites within this period. Problems of the identification of the major documented castles are not yet solved, although the periods of largest population on each site seem to be known with some certainty. The peak in ceramic technology and design comes with the late prehistoric period, and several prehistoric stages preceeding this climax period show the progressive accentuation of the ceramic traits which characterize the early historic sites. At the same time these prehistoric horizons show a rapidly decreasing incidence of other pottery styles, mainly those with decoration applied to neck and shoulder as well as on a collar.

Ceramic studies indicate that still earlier horizons not only show much higher incidence of these obsolescent styles, but also include forms transitional to earlier Woodland ceramic types. Sites which conform to such a projection backwards, of

trends seen in prehistoric Mohawk sites, are not abundant or large. Most of them are in the southern part of the Mohawk territory. As one follows seriations back in time, one shifts southward, into the Schoharie Valley and into the upper Susquehanna drainage. Geographically and typologically, these series lead toward the late Owasco series of the Bainbridge and Castle Creek Sites.⁴ Such a shift in time and space of major elements of Mohawk culture, from south to north, would correspond to a shift in population density from one periphery of Mohawk territory to the other, rather than to a migration. It would suggest Owasco as an indigenous ancestor of Mohawk, as well as of certain other local cultures, rather than as a non-Iroquoian predecessor of Mohawk. At any rate, the ceramic continuity would indicate that there was a continuity of communities from Owasco time levels up to the historic Mohawk sites, regardless of what the linguistic or genetic history of these communities had been during the same period. Ritchie prefers a more cautious interpretation of the scanty evidence available, and at present favors the view that Mohawk was, at early levels, a composite of Owasco and northern Iroquois elements.

Ritchie reported on excavations conducted during the past two years on the Clock Site, a late prehistoric Mohawk town, and on several earlier sites, including the Snell Site, the Chance Site, and the Dcowango Island Site, the two latter being type stations for important primitive Mohawk pottery types. Serious difficulties are raised by the size of the samples available from sites of this type, so small in comparison with the huge series so readily obtainable from later Mohawk sites. Sites are small, have no great depth or concentration of material, and relatively few of them have been discovered. Here, as in other areas, it appears to some of us as though small hamlets were the ordinary settlement pattern until the late prehistoric period, when population became concentrated into a few large towns or castles. A paper in progress by Ritchie, "The Chance Horizon; an Early Stage of Mohawk-Iroquois Cultural Development," includes analysis of all available data on the sites of this complex.

An earlier period in Mohawk ceramics is known from scattered samples of tiny size, and one small site of this type, the Oak Hill Site, has been excavated. In terms of the over-all ceramic reconstruc-

⁴ Ritchie, William A., *The Pre-Iroquoian occupations of New York. Rochester Museum Mem. 1: 29-74, 1944.*

tion, the Oak Hill Site is earlier than the Chance Site and the Deowango Island Site, and other sites of the same horizons can be placed in the series, but the Snell Site presents inconsistencies with this pattern. Cord-wrapped paddle-edge decoration appears in one type (Oak Hill Corded) in motifs later associated with incising on the Chance Incised and Deowango Incised pottery types. The small bulk of material and the somewhat capricious site differences of the little-known stages of the Oak Hill and preceding horizons suggest that the transition from a late Owasco to an early Mohawk culture, if it did occur, came as a revolution, as an almost momentary relaxation of form and style determinants and a rapid reorganization to new stability. Ritchie sees in this period rather, a certain tenacity of traditions, in a period of probable social unrest and conquest. He stresses the possibility of other interpretations than a straight evolutionary one, and suggested other factors which might be involved. It now appears that Mohawk will be the first full-scale test of the thesis of the local genesis of Iroquois culture, and progress in Mohawk archeology is at present more rapid than in any other phase of Iroquoian prehistory.

Stanley Gifford, of the Onondaga Historical Society, reported briefly on progress in Onondaga archeology, and started an enlightening discussion of some major problems of Onondaga ceramics. Gifford has returned recently to the Onondaga field, after a long period in other areas, and is currently engaged in an Onondaga site survey. Sites in the area of historic Onondaga occupation are still poorly known, and adequate interpretation of the large number of sites recorded is not yet possible. The broad relationships of historic Onondaga occupation to earlier sites of the Jefferson County area is clear, but detailed information from separable time-horizons is far from adequate.⁵

Gifford, MacNeish, and Ritchie were in agreement on an Onondaga pottery sequence which carried Onondaga material culture back through a number of Late Woodland stages, and pointed out parallel series in pipe forms. The pottery seriations, followed backward in time in late prehistoric times, show a lesser incidence of face-effigies as pot-rim decoration and a progressively stronger incidence of dentate-stamping rather than incising

as a decorative technique. Late sites show abundant face effigies and few if any dentate decorated rims; early sites have few face effigies and frequent dentate stamping. Pipes are abundant, delicately made, and show numerous design types; these provide other evidence of site relationships. Projection backwards in time of trends observed in these seriations would suggest the origin of Onondaga ceramics in a dentate-stamped, chevron-decorated pottery pertaining to an early Owasco time level (but certainly not to an Owasco-like culture). Such ceramic series, at a sufficiently early time level, are known in southern Ontario, especially in the Rice Lake area, and scattered examples are known from equally early neighboring cultures which are better understood. A reconstruction based on this evidence would place the earliest Onondaga candidates in lower Canada, with later gradual population shifts to the southward, ending with the historic castles and the Onondaga Reservation in the Syracuse area.

Jefferson County would appear to be the area in which Onondaga came to its prehistoric maturity, where most distinctive traits of Onondaga material culture were elaborated, where security and prosperity made possible a great increase in native population. This area may never have been abandoned, but very late in the prehistoric period the great bulk of the population moved to the southward. The Huron war may have been a major factor in the low population density of this area in the early colonial period. The shift to the south appears to be related to another population movement, inferred from the archeology, which has bearing on an important ethno-historical problem of the Saint Lawrence Valley, the identity of the Laurentian Iroquois.

A late prehistoric occupation of the Saint Lawrence Valley, typified by the Hochelega Site at Montreal, the Roebuck Site, and other sites north and east of the Adirondacks, apparently represents the material culture of the Iroquoian-speaking peoples found in this area by Cartier in 1535, but who were gone by the time of Champlain's visit when the area was found occupied by Algonkian-speaking tribes.⁶ Material from Laurentian Iroquois sites is not merely Onondaga-like; in most details it precisely resembles material from Jefferson County and Onondaga County sites of proto-historic stage, and differs more markedly from earlier

⁵ The bulk of published Onondaga data is summarized in Skinner, Alanson, Notes on Iroquois archeology, *Indian Notes and Monographs misc. ser.* 18, N. Y., Museum of the American Indian, Heye Foundation, 1921.

⁶ Wintemberg, W. J., Roebuck prehistoric village site, Grenville County, Ontario, *National Museum of Canada Bull.* 83, 1936.

and later Onondaga material. Laurentian Iroquois must represent an intrusion from Jefferson County (judging by pottery types, pipe forms, and bone tools) which became extinct in the early seventeenth century, was absorbed by Huron and Algonquin, or withdrew to the Onondaga area. Such strong and precise relationship of Laurentian Iroquois to Onondaga contradicts older linguistic and historical interpretations of the Laurentian Iroquois data, and it is suggested that other problems relating to these people are still open questions well worth further study. Laurentian Iroquois archeology was characterized in detail in MacNeish's reports at the Fourth and Sixth Conferences, and most of the specialists in the areas concerned seemed in good agreement with his interpretation as presented here.

Frank Ridley, of Islington, Ontario, presented a chronological and culture-area report on Ontario which was derived from his own research, and which included a vast bulk of new data. Of major interest was his definition of the Lalonde complex, scattered ceramic material from which is already well known, although poorly characterized in the literature and of unknown significance. Lalonde sites are large and concentrated, numerous, and are spread over a large part of Ontario, forming a sub-culture area much larger than Huron. Pottery is very closely related to Onondaga, with the same decorative motifs executed with the same type of incising which characterizes late prehistoric Onondaga, and done with the same exact control and symmetry. Most of these pots are much larger than Onondaga pots, and, partly because of that, have elongate necks and high collars. Associated pipes are clay elbow forms with trumpet-shaped and barrel-shaped bowls. Lalonde is earlier than prehistoric Huron, which overlies it on a number of excavated sites, and contrasts with Huron in almost every detail of material culture. Lalonde is not an obvious Huron ancestor, but is a Huron predecessor in Ontario. Despite the close Onondaga resemblances, the relationship is not clear. Chronologically, Lalonde should correspond to moderately early Onondaga horizons, and it does typologically except for some very confusing differences. Lalonde pottery shows no dentate stamping, and lacks face effigies. Discussion of these differences raised the question of the significance of dentate stamping in Onondaga; is it actually a vestigial trait, surviving in lesser and lesser incidence from Middle Woodland ancestors, or is it a specialized trick developed independently by

Onondaga potters at a much later time, like the rare dentate-stamp which appears late in Castle Creek as a new trait? At present it is impossible to equate Lalonde with our concepts of Onondaga history, and future Onondaga research will have to consider problems raised by Lalonde and by Laurentian Iroquois. Ridley considers Lalonde as a possible ancestor of both Huron and Onondaga.

Gordon K. Wright, as a representative of the Archaeological Society of Central New York, at Auburn, reported on recent studies in the Cayuga area, and Richard S. MacNeish supplemented this with some notes on Cayuga and Oneida archeology. Both areas make up the most poorly known sector of Five Nation's territory, and catalogued series from historic and late prehistoric Cayuga and Oneida sites are few indeed. The Archaeological Society of Central New York is of recent formation and many of its activities follow the earlier interest in historic sites of Harrison Follett, one of its founders. Follett, with the aid of the society's members, is currently engaged in locating and interpreting Cayuga sites, much in the fashion of Frederick Houghton's Seneca studies, and has begun to publish progress reports in the *Bulletin* of the Archaeological Society of Central New York. Site survey work, seriation studies, and study of trade goods as dating criteria, were noted as the major activities in Cayuga studies at the present time.

MacNeish commented on the near-identity of Cayuga and Oneida cultural materials, and reported briefly on ceramic seriation studies which suggest their derivation from a major late prehistoric culture, best represented by the Reed Site at Richmond Mills.⁷ Witthoft and MacNeish noted the close resemblances between Cayuga-Oneida and Susquehannock, and their apparent divergence from ceramic styles of the Richmond Mills type. In each case, very little is known of periods immediately preceding and following the Richmond Mills horizon, but parallel sequences rising from a Castle Creek (late Owasco) base are indicated.

Witthoft spoke of resemblances between these complexes, with Andaste-Susquehannock sharing two-barbed antler arrow points with Cayuga, and sharing foot-shaped pendants cut from bear molars with Richmond Mills. Strong ceramic resemblances and other shared culture traits, such as

⁷ Parker, Arthur C., *Archeological history of New York*, *New York State Museum Bull.* 235-238: 182-206, 1920.

antler comb styles, indicate especially close connections between these peoples.

Witthoft reported on Andaste-Susquehannock, stressing trade-goods and historic documentation, as well as seriations of native artifact types, as the basis for a historic reconstruction. Andaste-Susquehannock were indigenes of the North Branch of the Susquehanna, and moved into the West Branch and into the lower valley during the early seventeenth century. At the same time they effected major penetrations into the Ohio and Delaware Valleys, but their communities in effect migrated from the North Branch in New York and Pennsylvania south into the Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, area. In their area of origin, they were close neighbors of Cayuga, Oneida, and Seneca, and Susquehannock ceramics appear to be the end product of an evolutionary series arising from Castle Creek, diverging strongly from the Mohawk trend but only slightly from the Cayuga series. Recent excavations have been directed largely at interpretations of site sequence and at transitional phases of proto-Susquehannock archeology. Correlation of the Susquehannock sequence with the Seneca sequence is in progress, based on the occurrence of trade and captive pottery in sites of these two peoples.

Norman Emerson reported briefly on Huron progress, but declined to enlarge on many phases because of the absence of Canadian specialists, who, he felt, should report on their own studies at the next conference. The great importance of Huron becomes more apparent as the catalog of known sites of large size increases, and the dense occupation and large area of Huron are more emphatically recognized. Excavation in historic and prehistoric Huron sites is proceeding much faster than analysis and interpretation, but large samples from numerous sites in process of study promise good sequence analysis and very full knowledge of cultural inventories. Kenneth Kidd's excavations of the sites of Jesuit occupation permit exact dating of trade goods and Indian pottery types on these sites, and these in turn can be applied directly to Huron village sites. The excavation of documented and datable Huron town sites is also leading to extremely precise knowledge of historic Huron culture, and application of the techniques of the direct historical approach seems especially profitable in Huronia. While the origin and early prehistory of Huron are central problems under serious attack by Huron specialists, little progress has yet been made on this difficult question. Emer-

son called attention to the recent discovery and excavation of sites with ceramic complexes of other Iroquoian styles than Lalonde and Huron, and emphasized the vast areas which were still unknown and which probably had some relevance to Huron-Iroquois problems.

Frank Ridley described the excavation of a presumed Algonkian site on the south shore of Lake Nipissing where five different complexes were found in stratigraphic order. The historic component consisted entirely of Huron material, with European trade goods of the Jesuit period. It is not clear whether the Huron cultural material may not actually pertain to the Algonkian-speaking occupants of the Nipissing area. A lower level of the same site produced Lalonde pottery, again emphasizing the tremendous geographic distribution of some of these Candian complexes.

Charles Wray discussed recent work in Seneca archeology, limiting his statements to historic sites. Current progress is mainly in working out an archeological sequence by time differences within the historic period, rather than basing dates on historian's identifications of sites. Most of Wray's work, and of other studies on which he reported, was done on sites badly looted years ago, and represents an attempt to reinterpret classic sites in terms of available data and check excavations. The Adams Site represents the earliest historic Seneca site so far discovered, with sparse trade articles of European manufacture restricted to the cemetery and nearly absent from the midden sample.⁸ The ceramic sample from this site has a much smaller proportion of notched-rim pottery than any later Seneca site, and the other types represent the major clue to Seneca origins. Older students noted the resemblance of these forms to Richmond Mills pottery, while some of us are more impressed with the possibility of the derivation of such pottery from an important but undescribed complex of the upper Genesee Valley best known from the Dansville Flats. The Dansville pottery, and some types out of the chaotic series which have been called Neutral in western New York and adjacent areas, can be fitted into evolutionary series which suggest a local origin for the whole Seneca ceramic complex in earlier Woodland complexes which are not Owasco. Sites preceding the Adams Site have not yet been discovered, but the Hummel Site at Bristol, Ontario County, discussed at an earlier conference

⁸ Wray, Charles F., The Adams site, *Eastern States Archeological Federation Bull.* 9: 10, 1950.

by MacNeish, appears to be a somewhat earlier prehistoric site which fills one gap in such a site sequence from Woodland to Seneca.

Excavations at the Factory Hollow Site, a Seneca town early in the period of intensive European contact, included the location of a previously undiscovered cemetery and excavations in the village site.⁹ One significant stratigraphic change in the midden was the increasing percentage of notched-rim pottery types from bottom to top. An equally important feature was the concentration of Cayuga sherds and of extreme Seneca forms resembling Richmond Mills and Cayuga in the lower levels of the midden. These trade or captive sherds are distinct from the older Seneca forms and should not be confused with them in discussion of Seneca origins. Their distribution here suggests that contact with Cayuga was becoming less intimate, and may reflect trends in the Colonial history of the League of the Five Nations. One important job at this site was the excavation of the posthole pattern of a long house; to the best of my knowledge, this is the first time that a house outline has been worked out on a Five Nations site.

Further discussion centered about the Dann Site and the Boughton Hill Site, both considered to be documented sites of the later seventeenth century.¹⁰ More general discussion of the historic Seneca sequence, and of the problems of sequence-dating and year-dating within the historic period, followed. Apparently the principles of sequence-dating are more worth while procedures even in the most productive areas of historic occupation. Year-dating, based on the occasional documented site where the historic data are entirely unambiguous, seems an important but subsidiary technique, to be applied with extreme caution. Trade objects, of European origin, are important tools for locating sites within the historic period, but dates for most types of trade objects are known with too little certainty. At the present time it appears that extremely critical sequence-dating, with whatever subsidiary data can be derived from other sources, is the most worth while approach to better knowledge of trade goods. Glass beads are especially susceptible to such time-allocation by the sequence-dating of sites in which they are found. Wray and Witthoft are attempting the correlation of a

bead sequence worked out on the Seneca sites with a series worked out on Andaste-Susquehannock sites, and hope that such studies can be extended to set up a type sequence which can be checked and utilized in other areas.

Gordon Wright described the Long Point Site on Conesus Lake, excavated at two different periods by Ritchie and by Wright.¹¹ This is a shallow midden, with no shell content, and included distinctive artifacts from a number of cultures and time periods, as well as historic Seneca and Cayuga. This site is important because it is one of the very few sites which have produced any quantity of pottery which could fit as a connecting link between early historic Seneca pottery and a prehistoric culture of the upper Genesee Valley, best known from the Dansville Flats Site. The Dansville ceramic complex is probably contemporary in part with late Castle Creek, and has a generally Owascoid flavor, although both pottery and pipe forms are quite distinct from those of any Owasco culture. This complex, of unknown genesis, did not survive into the historic period, but has many Seneca-like features, and is favored by some students as a Seneca ancestor. The Long Point Site produced both Dansville and Seneca pottery types, along with others apparently intermediary between them. The relation of Seneca to Dansville, and of Dansville to Canandaigua (middle Owasco) are important problems in New York archeology, and very few sites relevant to these problems have yet been discovered. Of all the known complexes of the Seneca area, Dansville most resembles typical Seneca of the earliest historic period. Except for the poorly-known Hummel Site, previously mentioned, village sites of any transitional complex are completely unknown.

Richard McCarthy and Alexis Muller, of the Niagara County Historical Society, reported on several sites in the Niagara Frontier area of western New York. This area has never received professional attention and is known only from early site listings and scattered references. The term Neutral has generally been used in connection with these sites, both because they are in the area held by the peoples referred to as Neutral and because some of the material closely resembles prehistoric complexes of southwestern Ontario which Wintemberg assumed to be Neutral. Discussion be-

⁹ Parker, *Archeological History* 2: 657-658.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 2: 652 (Boughton Hill). Houghton, Frederick, The Seneca Nations from 1655 to 1687, *Bull. Buffalo Soc. Natural Sciences* 10: 364-464, 1912. (Dann Site, p. 413-417.)

¹¹ A report on this site is in press (January, 1951), in *Pennsylvania Archaeologist* 20 (3-4).

gan with the Shelby Circle and Oakfield, sites described by Squier.¹²

Shelby, a double ring fort of almost perfect circular shape, is not directly comparable to any known component. It lies in an area between the earliest historic Seneca and Neutral territories. MacNeish has suggested resemblances between Shelby pottery and Richmond Mills, and Witthoft feels that Shelby is related to early prehistoric Seneca. A very few objects are of "Neutral" types. The small collection of Oakfield pottery available shows relationship to the Kienuka Site. Kienuka, a site on the edge of the present Tuscarora Reservation, is a hodge-podge of prehistoric, historic, and reservation material.¹³ Within the site are two ossuaries, one of which was partially dug many years ago and completed recently by McCarthy. An undisturbed midden on the southern end of the site was not stratified but was dug in three arbitrary levels. The lowest level is related to the Middleport Site in Ontario,¹⁴ while the upper level includes pottery like the Goodyear Site, discussed later, and has been compared by MacNeish to the Clearville Site in Ontario, excavated by Wilfred Jury. The Kienuka excavation suggests that sites of the Neutral area can be fitted into a sequence leading from the prehistoric sites, of unknown age but of several stages, which Wintemberg called Neutral, to a historic Neutral complex suggested at Kienuka but well-defined at the Goodyear Site.

Marian White, of the Buffalo Museum of Science, described her excavations on the Goodyear Site, east of Buffalo, New York. This site is apparently of the same period as the Adams Site excavated by Wray, since trade goods of the same types as at Adams' were found in burials but not in the village site. Pottery at the Goodyear Site is very close to Huron pottery of the earliest historic period, and is a type known from other sites in adjacent Ontario and south to Erie, Pennsylvania. This is the first site which can be correlated with historic Neutral, and it is surprising that it appears to represent an extension of the Huron ceramic area. Small amounts of pottery of this type at such early Seneca sites as the Adams Site and the Factory Hollow Site now appear to be the work of Neutral rather than Huron captives. A number of other complexes from the area between

the Niagara Frontier and Huronia, many of them not obviously related to these two historic components, are omitted from discussion here for lack of information on their age, cultural inventories, and interrelationships.

Ross Pier Wright and Richard Wright, of the Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology, described their work on the Westfield Site, a salvage excavation conducted some years ago.¹⁵ One component at this site is a late prehistoric complex with strong Monongehela Woodland affinities, and shows certain relationships to the historic Ripley Site which has been considered Erie.¹⁶ The earlier component is not like other local sites which are known, but James B. Griffin points out close resemblances to some of the Uren material.¹⁷ Discussion shifted to the McFate Site at Cochran, Crawford County, Pennsylvania, excavated by the Pennsylvania Historical Commission in 1935-36. Two closely related components at McFate may be nearly contemporaneous; one of these is related to the later component at the Westfield Site, the other is represented on other sites in Cattaraugus County, New York. These sites all represent proto-historic complexes with shell-tempered pottery of simple forms, within the same well-developed bone industry and closely-related stone tool types. Some aspects of these sites may represent Erie peoples, and the closest counterparts are found in the alleged Erie sites of northeastern Ohio, and such Ohio drainage cultures as the local Monongehela Woodland variants. No stage of Erie culture can at present be identified with any certainty, and the lack of sufficient data and of artifact analyses from the historic Ripley Site and from related prehistoric sites leaves the problem completely open. The first need is an analysis of the Ripley Site, since we have no assurance that it has been correctly identified as Erie. Characterization of a historic Erie horizon is impossible at the present time. The relationships of McFate to Erie, and of Erie to other poorly-known prehistoric cultures of this immediate area, are far from clear. The archeology of the Allegheny Valley is as poorly known, and it is at present impossible to say what is relevant to Iroquoian problems in this area.

¹² Squier, E. G., *Antiquities of the State of New York*, 65-68, 71-72, Buffalo, 1851.

¹³ Parker, *Archeological History* 2: 632.

¹⁴ Wintemberg, W. J., The Middleport prehistoric village site, *National Museum of Canada Bull.* 109, 1948.

¹⁵ Anonymous, Westfield, N. Y., *Bull. Society for Pennsylvania Archaeology*, 2 (2): 4-6, 1931.

¹⁶ Parker, *Archeological History* 1: 246-306.

¹⁷ Wintemberg, W. J., Uren prehistoric village site, Oxford County, Ontario, *National Museum of Canada Bull.* 51, 1928.

Many other sites and more detailed reports were included in the discussions, but this account is limited, and I have tried to select the most important developments of this conference and those which show a certain consistency in a developing picture of Iroquois prehistory. The broad outline into which I have fitted these proceedings is certainly too simplified, yet the categories seen at the present time are some approximation to the order in which cultures existed in time and space.

Certain themes in these discussions seemed important, and are characteristic of more recent work in Iroquoian archeology. One development of this type is the increasing interest in historic sites as subjects of study in themselves, rather than merely as jumping-off places to prehistoric archeology. This is coupled with interests which are becoming more ethnologic, with archeology as a tool for the study of the ways of life of extinct communities. To be sure, the archeologist's source material is limited indeed as compared to the ethnologist's, but much of it is relevant to ethnology, especially where great modifications have taken place. Iroquoian

archeology, when done in close coordination with ethnological research, is a promising approach to deeper knowledge of many cultural problems besides chronology and artifact sequence. A large share in the enthusiasm of local students in the area today is due to the fact that Iroquoian archeology is pregnant with new puzzles, and that many of the most meaningful questions have yet to be asked. There is very little to be accomplished by merely thinking about problems, however; the ideas have to come from sites and objects, and knowledge must come from field work, not reworking of older ideas. Finally, the concepts of chronology, of sequence, and of geographic differentiation, which I may have over-emphasized in this paper, are transforming this pursuit from antiquarianism to prehistory. One can sense how much remains to be accomplished by comparing my crude culture area patterns with the more elaborate ones derived from ethnology and history by Fenton before 1940.¹⁸

¹⁸ Fenton, William N., Problems arising from the historic northeastern position of the Iroquois, *Smithsonian Misc. Coll.* **100**: 159-251, 1940.

LANCASTER PRESS, INC., LANCASTER,